Comments on the Commission's 2026 Public Safety Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update (Public Review Draft, October 23, 2026)

November 22, 2026

From: Steve Bridge, Lompoc City Council Member, District 1

I submit these comments as the District 1 Council Member only. The review period did not allow time for the full City Council to review a 387-page draft and adopt a formal response. My first request is for more time: 45 days from the release of a corrected draft.

The draft contains errors, some of which change its conclusions. These comments identify both those substantive errors and smaller typographical and accuracy corrections, so that the final report is accurate throughout. Three examples of the substantive errors:

- Crime trends are miscalculated. The draft reports a 250% drop in Lompoc burglaries. A decrease cannot exceed 100%; the correct figure is 71%.
- Lompoc is ranked last in the county for financial reserves. The draft divides the City's General Fund balance by revenue from all City funds, including the utilities. Measured against General Fund revenue, the reserve is 16% to 26%, not 5.5%.
- Several countywide totals do not add up, including emergency call volumes and public-safety spending.

The Lompoc profile also misstates the law on contracts between public agencies. It says a city needs Commission approval before contracting with another agency to provide a substitute service. Government Code 56133(e)(1) exempts those contracts from that requirement.

The draft also lists Mission Hills as a disadvantaged community, which Census and state data for Mission Hills and its census tracts do not seem to support. The listing matters because state law restricts a city's annexations next to a disadvantaged community, and Mission Hills is one of the City's planned growth areas.

On Lompoc's sphere of influence, the draft recommends keeping the Bodger Meadow site outside the sphere and then anticipates that "either an out-of-agency service agreement or annexation will likely follow" (page 262). State law does not permit an out-of-agency service agreement: a city may extend services outside its sphere only to address a threat to public health or safety (Government Code 56133). The annexation would first require adding the site to the sphere.

The draft also omits two documents. The first is the Commission's own May 7, 2026 resolution, which reaffirmed Lompoc's sphere and requires the City to prepare an

annexation plan by January 2031. The second is the City's December 17, 2025 letter identifying its planned growth areas. Both bear directly on Lompoc's sphere.

The Commission's 2023 denial of the City's Bailey Avenue request found growth at Vandenberg Space Force Base (Vandenberg SFB) too early to justify expansion. That is no longer true. Base and Air Force reports show the launch rate and workforce growing, and Lompoc is the closest city to the base. When the Commission reaffirmed Lompoc's sphere in May 2026, it made no new findings; the resolution does not mention that evidence, and neither the resolution nor its staff report mentions the City's December 2025 letter. Meanwhile, decisions are already being made in the areas the City has asked to plan for: since May, the County has approved an 87-room hotel and 60 apartments in Vandenberg Village. Because the Village is outside Lompoc's sphere, the City had no formal role. Inside the sphere, later County approvals there could be governed by a City–County agreement on development standards (Government Code 56425(b)–(c)).

I ask the Commission to extend the review period; correct and re-release the draft; remove the out-of-agency option for Bodger Meadow; record the City's planned areas as study areas; and begin updating Lompoc's sphere now rather than waiting for the January 2031 cycle. The need to plan for that growth is present now and deserves timely attention from the Commission.

Part 1: Systemic errors that may change conclusions

1.1 Crime "Trend" percentages are calculated incorrectly

The Lompoc crime tables (pages 275–276) calculate each "Trend" percentage by dividing the change by the 2024 figure. A percent change is measured from the starting figure, 2019. The error makes every decline look larger than it is, and some are impossible, because nothing can fall by more than 100%. Burglaries, for example, fell from 238 to 68. That is a 71% drop; the draft reports 250%. The table below compares the draft's figures with the correct ones.

Lompoc line, 2019 → 2024	Draft	Correct
Service calls (24,726 → 36,858)	+32.9%	+49.1%
Total reported crimes (5,164 → 3,084)	−67.4%	−40.3%
Burglary (238 → 68)	−250%	−71.4%
Burglary clearances (17 → 3)	−467%	−82.4%
Total clearances (489 → 248)	−97.2%	−49.3%
Homicide (7 → 0)	+0% (divides by zero)	−100%

Values below −100% also appear in the Montecito, Isla Vista, Buellton, Goleta, Santa Maria and Solvang profiles (pages 87, 148, 171, 220, 338, 366). Dividing by the 2024 figure reproduces the draft's Trend values exactly in the Lompoc, Santa Barbara (page 305), Santa Maria (page 338) and Solvang (page 366) tables, which confirms the same error there. The other profiles were not fully checked.

1.2 Lompoc's fund-balance ratio compares two different funds

The 5.5% ratio (Table ES-4, page 19) divides the $8.3 million General Fund balance by $149,199,156. That $149.2 million is all-funds revenue, including the utility enterprises. The draft's own revenue table shows it: property tax of $7,033,564 is 4.7% of $149,199,156 (page 276). On that basis the draft ranks Lompoc at the bottom of the county (page 30) and on the "leaner range" (page 43). The Lompoc attribute table labels the same 5.5% "Total Fund Balance" (page 270), which is a third, different measure. Santa Barbara's 5.8% has the same mismatch: the draft's own Santa Barbara revenue table (page 306) totals $565,386,779, including $304.8 million in charges for services.

The City's 2025 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (General Fund statement and management discussion; see Sources) gives fiscal year 2024-25 General Fund revenue of $51,080,827, an unassigned General Fund balance of $8.3 million and a total General Fund balance of $13.4 million. On a General Fund basis the ratio is 16.2% (unassigned) or 26.2% (total), not 5.5%. The report itself states the unassigned balance as 15.6% of General Fund expenditures, against a City policy target of 16.7%.

The error matters beyond the ranking. If Buellton or Solvang contracts with Lompoc for police, the draft says "the City of Lompoc would need to demonstrate it has adequate staffing and resources" (pages 158, 351). A finding that Lompoc has the county's lowest reserves works against the City on that test, and it is likely to be part of the record for Lompoc's next sphere decision (see Part 2).

1.3 Table ES-4 (page 19) values need correction

- Goleta's fund balance divided by revenue is 53.4%, not 20.7%. The 20.7% is repeated on page 30.
- Per-capita revenue, recomputed as revenue ÷ population: Carpinteria-Summerland district $983 (draft says $963), Montecito $3,631 ($3,473), Buellton $3,389 ($3,526), Guadalupe $1,611 ($950, also repeated on page 14), Solvang $5,340 ($3,388). Solvang's listed $3,388 equals Buellton's computed $3,389. The other wrong values do not match any row. Please explain how these values were calculated, or correct them.
- The Santa Maria row is blank, and its population is printed as "1113,041" (also in Table ES-2).
- Footnotes 2, 3 and 4 sit one row off. The note about the population the services district serves is marked on Montecito, and the Santa Maria note is marked on Isla Vista.
- The narrative ranges contradict the table. "from 5.5% of annual budget to 107% of annual budget" (page 15) leaves out Guadalupe at 163%. "$1,843,278 to $33,000,000" (page 30) leaves out Goleta at $53,181,822.

1.4 Table ES-3 call data needs correction (page 18)

- The Carpinteria-Summerland district and Solvang have identical rows: 43 calls, 30% emergency medical, 12% fire, 23% service calls and 39% miscellaneous. Those percentages add to 104%. Buellton's row also shows 43 calls and 30% emergency medical. Please confirm whether these rows are correct or whether one agency's data was repeated for the others, and correct them.
- Buellton, Carpinteria, Goleta and Solvang are given fire call data, though the draft says County Fire or the Carpinteria-Summerland district provides their fire service (pages 10, 28–29).
- Lompoc is shown at 11,951 calls. The Lompoc profile says 5,055 in 2025 (page 255) and "approximately 3,000" (page 267).
- The rows add up to 50,754, not the stated 51,827.
- The "38%" emergency-medical share is an unweighted average of the rows. Weighted by calls it is 75%.
- County Fire is shown at 10,700 calls, but page 1 says "over 17,000."

1.5 Finance totals in Chapter One (page 29)

- General fund revenue going from $266.1 million to $388.1 million over five years is 7.8% a year compounded, or 9.2% simple, not 13%.
- Public-safety spending going from $169.3 million to $233.3 million is +37.8%, not +72.5%. Each city's increase is listed at 23–41%, so the combined figure cannot be 72.5%. The 72.5% is used again on page 35 to support the overtime finding.
- "$382 million a year to provide fire, law enforcement and emergency medical services" (page 1) does not match the $233.3 million in public-safety spending. The draft does not say where the $382 million comes from.

1.6 Staffing ratios are swapped (page 27)

298 fire personnel ÷ 444,974 residents = 0.67 per 1,000, and 394 law-enforcement personnel = 0.89 per 1,000. The draft gives these the other way around.

1.7 Countywide crime statistics are internally inconsistent (page 28)

- Property 80% + simple assault 14% + violent 19% = 113%.
- If 80% of incidents are property crimes cleared at 14.6%, the overall clearance rate must be at least 11.7%. That is above the stated high of 11.5% and the stated average of 9%.
- The Executive Summary calls 20% "most" calls (page 2). It names Guadalupe's 17.7% the "highest" clearance rate, then gives Goleta 24% (page 13).

1.8 Population figures do not reconcile

- County Fire's 186,977 is labelled a 2026 Department of Finance figure (Table ES-2). Page 112 builds it from a 2019 Santa Barbara County Association of Governments forecast of 143,000 unincorporated residents in 2020, plus 43,977 for Buellton, Goleta and Solvang. Table ES-2 puts those three cities at 43,383. Page 8 also says County Fire covers "the entire unincorporated" area, and page 22 gives 172,000.

- The 143,000 covers all unincorporated residents, but Table ES-2 also counts Montecito's residents under Montecito Fire and the Carpinteria-Summerland district's residents under that district. County Fire's unadopted 2025 Fire Code ordinance likewise applies to unincorporated areas "except the areas within the Carpinteria/Summerland Fire Protection District, Montecito Fire Protection District" (Section 15-1; see Sources). So Montecito's 8,638 residents and the 5,135 unincorporated residents of the Carpinteria-Summerland district (17,747 − 12,612; Table ES-2 and footnote 1) are counted twice: in County Fire's total and again under their own districts.

- 444,974 minus the eight cities in Table ES-2 (305,841) leaves 139,133 unincorporated residents, not 143,594.

- Countywide population is said to fall "close to a two percent overall decrease or 1.5% annually" over 10 years (page 22), which is self-contradictory. The Lompoc profile says the county grew 3.97% from 2010 to 2026 (page 264).

- Several 2015–2025 changes on pages 24–25 do not reconcile with 2026 populations. For example, the draft says Solvang's population "increased by approximately 400 people," or 6.78 percent, from 2015 to 2025 (page 25). That implies about 5,900 in 2015 and 6,300 in 2025, but Table ES-2 gives 5,621 for 2026.

- **The growth determination does not account for Vandenberg SFB.** The draft's projections come from the 2019 Association of Governments forecast, which page 112 calls a "conservative trend-base" method, and from the 2023–2031 Housing Elements (pages 23, 265). None mentions Vandenberg SFB's expansion. Since then the Air Force has authorized up to 100 Falcon launches a year (October 10, 2025), and base leadership projects its workforce of about 10,000 could reach 20,000 by 2030, about 80% living off-base (see Sources). At that share, the base's projected growth alone is about 8,000 more off-base workers by 2030, not counting their households. The draft projects Lompoc Valley growth of 7,263 residents over 2021–2050 (page 23). The determination on growth and population should be revised to account for the base. It is likely to be part of the record for Lompoc's next sphere decision (see Part 2).

1.9 Disadvantaged-community threshold

The draft uses a statewide median household income of $120,200, giving an 80% threshold of $96,160 (pages 26, 266), with no source, and also calls it a "statewide average" (page 266). Water Code 79505.5 defines a disadvantaged community as one with income below 80% of the statewide annual median household income (see Sources). The Census Bureau's

2020–2024 American Community Survey figure is $99,122, which gives a threshold of $79,298 (Census QuickFacts).

Census table B19013 (2020–2024 survey) against the $79,298 threshold:

Community	Median household income (± margin of error)	Below $79,298?
Lompoc	$72,004 ± $6,755	Yes
Guadalupe	$66,930 ± $10,686	Yes
Isla Vista	$25,972 ± $5,478	Yes
New Cuyama	$60,759 ± $5,129	Yes
Santa Maria	$84,746 ± $4,196	No
Mission Hills	$111,974 ± $25,310	No
Garey	$162,679 ± $69,872	No

The Census Bureau publishes no estimate for Casmalia, Cuyama or Sisquoc, and lists no place named Devon.

Santa Maria qualifies only under the draft's threshold. The draft gives its income as $74,986 (page 26); the Census figure is $84,746, above the $79,298 threshold. The draft's Lompoc, Guadalupe and Isla Vista figures match the Census table exactly, so the Santa Maria figure does not come from the same source.

1.10 Statute citations

- **Audit requirement cites the wrong law.** The draft says "State law requires" each agency to file an audit within 12 months, faults Guadalupe and Santa Maria for late audits, and states that "Both Cities shall immediately assemble" them (pages 7, 16, 31). The law it cites, Government Code 26909, applies to special districts, not cities (see Sources). The draft should cite the correct authority for city audits or remove the directive. Its audit dates also conflict: page 7 says neither city has completed an audit since 2022; page 16 says 2022 and 2023. Because Santa Maria's and Guadalupe's figures are unaudited by the draft's own account, every countywide total that includes them carries that caveat.

- Public Records Act sections 6253 and 6270.5 (page 284) were repealed and recodified into Government Code 7920.000 and following, operative January 1, 2023, by Assembly Bill 473 (see Sources).

1.11 Area figures conflict

The draft's area figures conflict with each other or with arithmetic on the draft's own numbers:

Item	What the draft says	Problem
Study area, countywide	"This Study covers approximately 2,737 acres" (page 9)	Lompoc alone is 11.59 square miles, or 7,418 acres. It cannot be acres; it may be square miles.

Item	What the draft says	Problem
County Fire private land	"Close to three-fifths or 4%" of parcel acreage is private (page 40)	Three-fifths is 60%, not 4%.
Lompoc sphere beyond city limits	376 acres (page 253); 360 acres (page 259); the listed parcels total 365+ acres (page 259)	Three different figures.
Acreage inside Lompoc	6,662 acres "(parcels and public rights-of-ways)" (page 262)	The boundary table labels 6,662 as parcel acres (page 263), and page 264 says rights-of-way are in addition. 11.59 square miles is 7,418 acres, leaving about 756 acres of right-of-way, consistent with page 264. Page 262's description is wrong.
Lompoc government-owned land	3,439 acres (page 262); 3,997.2 acres, "60%" (page 264)	3,997.2 is 60% of 6,662; 3,439 is 52%. Only one can be right.
Lompoc undeveloped private land	40% of parcel acreage is private and 74% of it developed; the remainder is "107 vacant parcels that collectively total 325 acres" (page 264)	40% of 6,662 is about 2,665 acres. The undeveloped 26% is about 693 acres, not 325.
Share under Lompoc land-use authority	"98.2% incorporated," 1.8% unincorporated (page 262)	The boundary table gives 66.7% City and 33.3% County (page 263), and the table's rows add up to its 10,001.92-acre total.
Bodger Meadow	65 acres (Table I-1, page 261); 49.11 acres (map, page 262); 43.0 acres as "Bodger (Ag Blds.)" (boundary table, page 263)	Three different figures.

Please correct these figures or state the basis for each.

Part 2: City of Lompoc profile

Why the Lompoc determinations matter. The draft asks the Commission to take no action on Lompoc: its formal recommendations cover adoption of the review and three fire-district spheres (pages 6–7). The Lompoc determinations still carry weight. When the Commission reaffirmed Lompoc's sphere on May 7, 2026, it did not make new findings; Resolution 26-08 incorporated the determinations of earlier service reviews, including the 2021 fire, law enforcement and emergency medical services review that this draft replaces

(see Sources). What this draft says about Lompoc's growth, finances and disadvantaged communities is therefore likely to be the record the Commission relies on when it next updates Lompoc's sphere, whether now, as recommendation 4 asks, or by January 2031. The sphere conclusion has immediate consequences; these determinations have lasting ones.

2.1 Out-of-agency service law is stated in reverse (page 256)

The draft says cities may contract to provide a substitute service "after first requesting and receives written approval from LAFCO." Government Code 56133(e)(1) says the opposite. It exempts agreements between two or more public agencies where the service is an alternative to, or substitute for, a service an existing provider already gives, at a consistent level of service (Gov. Code 56133). Whether a Lompoc contract with Buellton and Solvang qualifies turns on level of service, which the draft says is still to be determined (page 256). A 2022 white paper from the statewide association of these commissions, presented to this Commission, argues that each commission decides whether the exemption applies (see Sources). The draft does not make that argument; it states the rule in reverse.

2.2 Bodger Meadow study area (pages 261–262)

- The site is given three different sizes: 65 acres (Table I-1), 49.11 acres (map, page 262) and 43.0 acres (boundary table, page 263). See 1.11.
- 200 single-family lots plus 140 apartments is 340 units, and 20% of that is 68, not 65.
- Page 262 says the County will evaluate a sphere expansion. Under Government Code 56076, a sphere is "a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission" (see Sources): the Commission determines it, not the County. The draft cites the same section on page 8.
- Staff recommends leaving the site out of the sphere, but expects that "either an out-of-agency service agreement or annexation will likely follow" (page 262). Government Code 56133 does not allow that. A city may extend services outside its boundaries in anticipation of a later annexation only if the area is inside its sphere (subsection (b)). Outside a sphere, service is allowed only to address an existing or impending threat to public health or safety (subsection (c)). The Commission's own out-of-agency service status report states the same rule (Information Item 7; see Sources). The one exception in state law, a pilot program under Government Code 56133.5, applied only to the Napa and San Bernardino commissions (see Sources). The draft must choose: add Bodger Meadow to Lompoc's sphere, or drop the expectation that the City will serve it.

2.3 Boundary statements contradict the draft

The profile's area figures are in 1.11. Two other statements are wrong:

- "The jurisdictional boundary qualifies as a disadvantaged unincorporated community" (page 264). Lompoc is incorporated, as page 26 itself says.

- "The City of Lompoc overlaps the Community Service Districts of Mission Hills" (page 255). The draft itself places Mission Hills outside the city: page 258 calls the Vandenberg Village and Mission Hills districts "the nearest communities along the northern and northeast border of the City," and page 256 calls them "neighboring communities." The word "overlaps" should be corrected to "adjoins."

2.4 Mission Hills is listed as disadvantaged without clear support (pages 26, 266)

The draft lists Mission Hills as a disadvantaged unincorporated community, contiguous to Lompoc's sphere (page 266). The data do not support that listing:

- Census Bureau: Mission Hills' median household income is $111,974 (± $25,310). Even the low end of that range, $86,664, is above the $79,298 threshold for a disadvantaged community (see 1.9).
- State mapping tool: the Department of Water Resources tool, which the draft says staff used (page 26), marks Mission Hills "not disadvantaged" in all three data periods it covers (2014–2018, 2016–2020 and 2019–2023). Both census tracts that overlap Mission Hills are also "not disadvantaged" (see Sources).
- One small census block group that overlaps part of Mission Hills is marked disadvantaged. The draft does not say whether that was its basis.

The listing matters. State law restricts a city's annexation of more than 10 acres next to a disadvantaged unincorporated community (Government Code 56375(a)(8)(A)), and Mission Hills is one of the City's planned growth areas. The draft is also inconsistent: page 266 lists Mission Hills, while the Chapter One determination for Lompoc says only that any such community "would need to be identified" (page 26).

The draft should state the data and geography it used to list Mission Hills as disadvantaged, or remove the listing.

2.5 Fire Department

- Roster: page 255 lists 30 positions, including nine Engineers and a Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal. Page 273 lists 26, with six Engineers and an Office Staff Assistant.
- "29 are assigned to three operational shifts" (page 255): the shift positions are 3 + 6 + 9 + 9 = 27, and 27 ÷ 3 = 9 matches the stated daily staffing of nine (page 258). The staffing table also says 27 (page 272).
- On duty: "6 firefighters on duty at all times" (page 266) versus nine (page 258).
- Calls: 5,055 in 2025 (page 255) versus "approximately 3,000 calls per year" (page 267).
- "Response times throughout the City are 3.5 minutes" (page 267) gives no percentile, no time segment and no source.

2.6 Police Department

- "Has its own jail" and "a fully equipped SWAT team" (pages 255, 268), but on page 257 "would still need" the Sheriff "for jail booking, SWAT… that Lompoc does not have."
- The jail building is "built in 1959" (page 271), but the station table says 1986.
- Out of date: "Once the Northern Branch Jail is open" (page 271). That jail was occupied January 22, 2022 (Sheriff's Office).
- Uncited source: the jail paragraph on page 271 matches the Lompoc City Jail section of the 2019-20 Grand Jury detention report sentence for sentence: the 1959 building, seven cells for 19 detainees, the 96-hour hold, custody staffing, female searches, and "no special documented procedures" for medical or mental problems. The draft does not cite that report (see Sources).
- Contradicted: the Police Department's jail manual (2021 edition and 2025 draft) contains a Medical/Mental Health chapter, including policies on screening and evaluations, suicide prevention, and availability and standards of care. That contradicts the "no special documented procedures" statement (see Sources).
- "National average of 105" sworn officers for a city of Lompoc's size (page 257) has no source.

2.7 Crime statistics (pages 274–276)

- Besides the formula error in 1.1: the text claims "an approximate 15 percent decrease in total annual service calls between 2020–2025," but the table goes from 26,068 in 2020 to 36,858 in 2024, which is +41%.
- Calls per 1,000 residents: 755.5 (text) versus 773 (snapshot).
- "23 reported crimes for every 1,000 residents": the table's average Total Reported Crimes of 4,273.5 gives 99.2 per 1,000, and violent plus property crimes (1,143) give 26.5. Neither gives 23.
- "One reported crime for every 133.9 service calls": average service calls (33,289) ÷ average violent crimes (248.5) = 134, so that is calls per **violent** crime. Calls per total reported crime is 7.8.
- Total Reported Crimes (5,164 in 2019) is not violent plus property (1,348), and the draft does not define the row. The draft says its crime data come from the state Department of Justice OpenJustice site (page 14). In that dataset, the totals are violent crimes (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault) and property crimes (burglary, motor vehicle theft, larceny-theft), with arson reported separately. So Total Reported Crimes is not a Department of Justice measure. Please identify its source and define it. The draft also describes clearance as a crime "resulting in an arrest or determined to be unfounded" (page 275). The Department of Justice

counts a crime as cleared by arrest or by exceptional means; "unfounded" is not one of its clearance categories (see Sources).

- "Average overall clearance rate is 17.8%" and a range "from a low of 4% to a high of 75%": the table's Clearances to Crimes row runs from 6.2% to 9.5% and averages 7.4%.

- The property clearance rate is given as 6.7%. Recomputed for 2020–2024 it is 8.1%. The draft calls Lompoc's clearance rates "both lower and higher than the national averages," but both are lower: violent crimes 29.7% against 44%, property crimes 6.7% against 16% (page 275).

- The table's Average column includes 2019 (six years), while the text uses 2020–2024. The national comparison figures have no source.

2.8 Finances (pages 276–283)

- The fiscal year 2023-24 percentages in the revenue table are wrong. Recomputed from the dollars: sales tax 11.8% (draft says 13.1%), other taxes 8.0% (8.7%), charges for services 57.9% (55.8%), grants 11.3% (14.1%), interest 4.7% (1.3%), other 1.4% (2.0%). The fiscal year 2024-25 column checks out.

- "Expenditures have remained relatively flat in comparison to its revenues" (page 276): from fiscal year 2022-23 to 2024-25, spending rose 27.6% ($110.6 million to $141.1 million) while revenue rose 11.5%.

- The "$105.2 million in long-term debts" ($76.7 million governmental, $28.5 million business-type, $0.3 million fiduciary; page 256) is the City's net pension liability, as the 2025 financial report states. The report gives long-term debt, excluding pensions, as $79,161,004.

- The combined pension and retiree-health figures for 2022 and 2023 are right. The 2025 financial report shows retiree health as a net asset in those years (−$4,103,863 and −$441,136), and a 71.5% pension funded ratio in both 2023 and 2024. The one difference is the 2022 pension liability: $37,708,776 in the draft versus $37,708,766 in the report.

- Chapter One says only Montecito, Carpinteria and Goleta have benefit trusts (page 29). The 2025 financial report says Lompoc entered a California Employers' Retiree Benefit Trust agreement in fiscal year 2008-09.

- Water refunding bonds: the draft gives $798,569 as principal outstanding (page 282). The 2025 financial report gives $5,730,000 outstanding. The $798,569 is the principal and interest paid in fiscal year 2024-25.

- Landfill (page 283): the draft gives 8.5 years of remaining capacity and a 2047 closing date. The 2025 financial report has both figures, and says the City is evaluating expansion options to reach 2047. The draft leaves out the expansion condition.

- Public safety: $26.6 million actual in fiscal year 2024-25 (page 279) versus $26.2 million in Table ES-2, which is labelled "2025" but matches the fiscal year 2025-26 budget figure ($26,202,474).
- The text says "15-year capital improvement plan" but describes the "2025-2031" plan (page 281).
- "100% of its employees utilizing authorized overtime" (page 279) does not say which employees.
- The draft says about 268 full-time employees (pages 256, 283), while the 2025 financial report says 389.25 budgeted full-time positions.

2.9 Growth and demographics

- The table projects 49,000 residents in 2030 (page 265), but the draft gives 43,073 residents in 2026 (page 253) and reports a decline since 2015 (page 264).
- Growth is given as 9.2% for 2020–2050 (pages 40, 265), the table shows 14.7% (45,500 to 52,200), and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments figure is 13.3% for the Lompoc Valley (page 23).
- The age groups add up to 94% (page 265).
- Housing allocation: the draft says 2,500 units (page 265), but the City's Housing Element page says 2,248 (see Sources).
- 2030 General Plan: the draft says the plan was adopted in 2013 (pages 39, 265). That fits Phase 1 only. An October 9, 2013 Planning Commission staff report recommended Resolution 763(13), which recommends that the Council adopt the Phase 1 elements (Introduction, Land Use and Circulation) (see Sources). The plan's own Introduction says the 2030 update was done in two phases: Housing, Land Use and Circulation first, then Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Parks and Recreation, Urban Design and Public Services. Elements have been amended since, for example the Housing Element re-adopted on November 19, 2024 and Safety Element amendments adopted on September 2, 2025 (see Sources).
- 2050 General Plan: the draft says the update officially started in February 2026 (page 259). The City's 2050 General Plan schedule presented to the Council (file dated January 16, 2026; see Sources) recommends a February 3, 2026 all-hands kick-off study session and a Council adoption hearing in early October 2028.

2.10 Council roster and survey (pages 284–285)

- Minor correction (accuracy only; affects no finding): the roster's Mayor Pro Tem listing is incorrect. The Background column also has six entries for five members.
- The Lompoc profile reports community survey results from 38 responses (pages 285–286); every other agency profile reports none. The draft does not say how the survey was distributed or who could respond. Please explain how the survey was distributed and why only Lompoc has responses. With 38 responses in a city of

about 43,000 (page 253), the draft should not present the results as representing residents' views.

Part 3: Other countywide contradictions

- **Hollister Avenue (the one boundary action).** The draft's recommended action 4 says the right-of-way is "not currently within the boundaries of a fire protection agency" (page 7). Page 41 says the amendment covers properties "already within the boundaries of a fire protection agency." The November 12, 2026 hearing notice repeats the first version.
- **County Fire's sphere.** Page 1 says the sphere extends beyond the boundary (Channel Islands, 2021). Page 8 says all three fire districts' spheres match their boundaries. Page 42 says only County Fire's sphere extends beyond its boundary.
- **City spheres.** Page 8 says Carpinteria has sphere area outside its limits. Page 39 says it has none.
- **Elected mayors.** "Seven of the eight Cities" elect the mayor at large with council districts (page 16), versus five (page 33). Page 16 itself excludes Guadalupe, whose council is elected at large, and Carpinteria, whose mayor is chosen by the council. That leaves at most six, and page 33 names five.
- **Growth rates.** Guadalupe 27.9% and Buellton 19.9% (page 23), versus 1.8% and 8.9% (pages 39–40). Page 42 names Lompoc, Guadalupe and Buellton as the fastest-growing on that basis.
- **Guadalupe.** It has the highest fund-balance ratio (163%), yet it is described as on the "leaner range" (page 43).
- **Regional Fire Communications Center: improvement claim.** "This change has improved response times and surge capacity" (page 28) comes with no data, and page 9 defers the first trend to 2031.
- **Regional Fire Communications Center: unattributed text.** The text on page 11 ("integrated with our CAD [computer-aided dispatch] system") is written in the first person with no attribution. Please identify its source or attribute it.
- **Regional Fire Communications Center: start date.** "In 2024/25, over 38% of all calls… by the Regional Fire Communications Center" (page 12) comes before the center started. The draft gives that start as July 2025 (pages 2, 9, 28) and as May 13, 2025 (page 319), itself a contradiction; either way the center operated for at most seven weeks of fiscal year 2024-25.
- **Separate medical-response agency study (pages 2, 15).** The draft does not mention that the Board of Supervisors granted American Medical Response exclusive ambulance rights on February 11, 2025, with an initial four-year term (Independent, Independent). Any such study would have to start from that contract. The claim that it "could greatly reduce training costs" has no supporting analysis.

- **Base name.** "Vandenberg Air Force Base" (pages 32, 377) and "VAFB" (page 267) should be Vandenberg Space Force Base, the name the draft itself uses on page 253.

- **Two-in/two-out rule.** The rule is attributed to a "California Occupational Safety and Health Association" (page 30), but it comes from federal regulation 29 CFR 1910.134(g)(4) and the state equivalent, Title 8, section 5144(g)(4), which requires at least two employees inside and two outside in interior structural fires (see Sources).

Part 4: Open items

- Definitions: Appendix C (pages 377–378) defines only calls-for-service categories, the ISO rating, taxation data and apparatus types. It does not define Service Calls, Incident Reports, Total Reported Crimes or clearance.

- Minor corrections (accuracy only): the council roster's Mayor Pro Tem listing is incorrect, and its Background column is misaligned (2.10).

Part 5: Sphere of influence — the legal definition and how the draft applies it

5.1 What the law says

- **Definition.** Government Code 56076: a sphere of influence is "a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission."

- **Duty.** Government Code 56425(a): "the commission shall develop and determine the sphere of influence of each city and each special district" and enact policies to promote "the logical and orderly" development of areas within the sphere.

- **Required written findings.** Government Code 56425(e): in determining each sphere, the Commission "shall consider and prepare a written statement of its determinations" on (1) present and planned land uses, including agricultural and open-space lands; (2) present and probable need for public facilities and services; (3) present capacity and adequacy of the agency's services; (4) any relevant social or economic communities of interest; and (5) for a city or district providing sewer, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection, the needs of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere.

- **Review cycle.** Government Code 56425(g): every five years the Commission "shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence."

5.2 Where the draft follows it and where it departs

- **Follows it.** Page 8 restates the definition correctly: "the plan representing LAFCO's determination for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency." The November 12, 2026 hearing notice does not. It attributes the definition to Government Code 56425 and quotes it as "…a plan for the probable physical boundary and service area of a local agency or municipality…". The definition is in 56076, which says "boundaries" and contains no "or municipality."

- **Who decides.** Page 262 says the Bodger Meadow properties "will be evaluated by the County under a builder's remedy proposal to include a Sphere of Influence expansion." Under 56076 and 56425(a) the Commission, not the County, determines a sphere.

- **A Lompoc sphere recommendation that does not address the current resolution.** Page 262 recommends that Lompoc's sphere "should exclude Study Area One" and that the existing sphere be maintained, and Chapter Two's 56425(e) determinations cover only the three fire districts (page 37). Lompoc's current sphere rests on Resolution 26-08 (May 7, 2026), which incorporates the 56425(e) determinations by reference from the 2021–2025 service reviews (see Sources). The draft does not cite that resolution, and the reviews it relies on predate the City's December 17, 2025 letter and Exhibit A map (recommendation 4).

- **Terms not in the statute.** The Notice of Exemption calls the sphere "a 20-year growth boundary" (page 380). Neither 56076 nor 56425(a), (e) or (g) uses a 20-year term.

- **Sphere history out of date.** The draft says city spheres "were updated in 2016 and will be re-considered following subsequent municipal service reviews" (page 375). That is out of date. On May 7, 2026 the Commission adopted Resolution 26-08, 6–0, reaffirming Lompoc's sphere with no change to its map and conditioning it: the City "shall develop an annexation plan by or before their next cycle of sphere of influence adoption," and if no plan is submitted before that cycle "(January 2031), then the Commission may consider reducing the sphere boundary" (see Sources). The draft should cite Resolution 26-08 and its condition.

- **Disadvantaged-community factor.** When Lompoc's sphere is updated, 56425(e)(5) will apply, because Lompoc provides structural fire protection (page 256). That factor covers disadvantaged communities within the existing sphere. The separate service-review determination covers those within or contiguous to it (page 26).

Part 6: Conclusions and recommendations

1. **Extend the review period.** The Commission's hearing notice, dated November 12, 2026, is titled a "21-day public review" but gives a period that "runs through November 5, 2026 to December 8, 2026," with comments "due by 5:00 pm on Monday December 7th" and the public hearing on Thursday, December 10, 2026 (see Sources). The notice was issued a week after its own review period began. The Commission's own September 3, 2026 status presentation scheduled a "30-day comment period"; from the notice date to the December 7 comment deadline is 25 days (see Sources). Lompoc's City Council meets on the first and third Tuesdays (page 284), and each agenda must be posted 72 hours ahead (page 284). Inside the comment window the Council has two meetings, November 17 and December 1, 2026, to receive a 387-page document, direct staff and approve a formal response. For a document of this importance to another government agency, that is inadequate, and it is why these comments come from me rather than from the

Council. Request: a review period of 45 days from the release of the corrected draft (recommendation 2).

2. **Correct the draft and re-release it.** Several errors in Parts 1 through 3 change stated conclusions, including Lompoc's fund-balance ranking (1.2), the countywide finance and crime findings (1.5, 1.7), the contracting law (2.1), the Bodger Meadow service agreement (2.2) and the disadvantaged-community listings (1.9, 2.4). The corrections should be incorporated and the corrected draft re-released, with the 45-day review period in recommendation 1, before the Commission acts.

3. **Strike the out-of-agency service agreement for Bodger Meadow.** The draft keeps Bodger Meadow outside Lompoc's sphere and then anticipates "either an out-of-agency service agreement or annexation" (page 262). The law does not allow that agreement.

   - Service in anticipation of a later annexation must be within the sphere (56133(b)).
   - Outside a sphere, service is allowed only "to respond to an existing or impending threat to the health or safety of the public" (56133(c)).
   - The Commission's own October 5, 2023 status report states the same rule (see Sources).
   - The only statutory pilot allowing more, Government Code 56133.5, applies to the Napa and San Bernardino commissions only.

   The draft should strike the out-of-agency service agreement. It should state that serving Bodger Meadow would first require a Commission sphere amendment, with the written determinations 56425(e) requires. It should also correct the statement that the County will evaluate a sphere expansion.

4. **Recognize Lompoc's planned areas and begin a sphere update now.**

What the City has told the Commission. By letter of December 17, 2025, at the Council's direction, the City wrote to the Executive Director about expanding Lompoc's sphere of influence, with a map, Exhibit A, "Proposed Sphere of Influence" (see Sources). The letter and map together identify these areas:

- West: the Bailey Avenue corridor, including Bodger Meadows (270 acres per the letter).
- North: Vandenberg Village, Providence Landing, Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks and Lane's End.
- South: the developed areas along San Miguelito Road (labeled "Miguelito Canyon" on Exhibit A).

- The area between Floradale Avenue and the City Waste Water Treatment Plant. The letter names it; Exhibit A does not label it, and the map should be corrected.
- East: River Park.
- Any City-owned properties or infrastructure.

The letter states the City will apply for these expansions after its General Plan update. That update's adoption hearing is scheduled for October 2028.

What the draft says. The draft does not mention the letter, the map, the Sustainable Agricultural Land Conservation grant study or the Memorandum of Agreement framework the letter describes. It names only the existing out-of-agency service area and the Bailey Avenue Corridor (page 260), and its only Lompoc study area is 65 acres of Bodger Meadow (page 261).

Why it matters. On September 1, 2022 the City applied to add 148.3 acres of the Bailey Avenue corridor, including 107.7 acres of the Bodger property, to its sphere. The Commission took a conceptual vote to deny on February 2, 2023 and formally denied the request 6–1 on April 6, 2023, citing the loss of prime agricultural land (Commission Consent Item 3, April 6, 2023; Noozhawk; see Sources). Later that year the Bodger owners filed a preliminary application under the builder's remedy (KCBX, July 6, 2026; see Sources). That option was open because the County's Housing Element, a required element of its General Plan, was uncertified from February 2023 to January 2024 (Santa Barbara Independent, January 23, 2024; see Sources). The denial did not keep Bodger Meadow agricultural. It moved the decision from the City and the Commission to the County, and left an out-of-agency service agreement the law does not allow (recommendation 3). Unless the City's planned areas are recognized now, the same sequence can repeat elsewhere.

Vandenberg SFB's growth is no longer early-stage. The Commission's 2023 denial found growth at Vandenberg SFB too early to justify expansion. Since then, the base launched 51 times in 2024 and 71 times in 2025. On October 10, 2025, the Air Force authorized up to 100 Falcon launches a year, double the prior limit. Base leadership projects that its workforce of about 10,000 could reach 20,000 by 2030, with about 80% living off-base and no new on-base housing for at least five years (see Sources). Lompoc is the nearest city: 9.9 road miles from the main gate, against 17.4 from Santa Maria and 23.0 from Buellton (OpenStreetMap routing). Each 1,000 base workers housed in Santa Maria rather than Lompoc adds about 15,000 vehicle-miles a day; in Buellton, about 26,200 (one commuter per vehicle, measured from each city hall). The premise of the 2023 finding has changed, and the draft should say so.

Decisions in the City's planned areas are still being made by the County alone. On November 17, 2026, the Board of Supervisors voted 5–0 to approve the Constellation Land Development project on a vacant 5.16-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number 097-371-072) in the commercial core of Vandenberg Village: a three-story, 87-room extended-stay hotel and 60 apartments (24 one-bedroom, 36 two-bedroom). Because two impacts could not be fully mitigated, the Board adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations (see

Sources). The parcel lies in an area the City has asked to add to its sphere; because the area is outside Lompoc's sphere, the City had no formal role in the decision.

A second project is under way less than a mile away. Lompoc Unified School District is pursuing about 200 rental units in nine two- and three-story buildings on the Maple High School campus at 4010 Jupiter Avenue: 100 affordable units for lower- and moderate-income households and 100 at market rate, with priority for school-district and other public employees. The district selected Space Valley Housing Partners as its developer on February 17, 2026, and approved an exclusive negotiating agreement on April 21, 2026; it says state law allows the project without rezoning (see Sources). Together, the two projects would add about 260 apartments and an 87-room hotel to the Village, whose sewage the City treats.

The Vandenberg Village district's comment. The district's April 28, 2026 letter to the Commission opposes adding the Village to Lompoc's sphere. It argues that the Village is near build-out, that the district's services are independent of the City, and that growth scenarios dependent on future General Plan updates and projections are "speculative" (see Sources). The Commission adopted Resolution 26-08 nine days later without addressing it. The draft should answer it:

1. A sphere looks forward by definition. The letter says spheres must rest on "existing conditions and a demonstrated, probable need." The statute is broader: a sphere is "a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area" (Government Code 56076), and the required findings cover "present and planned land uses" and "present and probable need" (56425(e)(1)–(2)). Recording the City's planned areas as study areas is what the statute contemplates, and what Resolution 26-08 asked for when it required an annexation plan.

2. Treatment is a City service. The letter says the district's treatment contract "does not constitute municipal wastewater service delivery." The Village's sewage is treated at the City's plant under the City's discharge permit (Order R3-2022-0004, adopted February 17, 2022), which names the Vandenberg Village Community Services District and Vandenberg Space Force Base in its discharger information. The district's wastewater ordinance (draft 2.19) exists to comply with its contract with the City and to support compliance with the City's discharge permit (see Sources). That is the City's capacity, which 56425(e)(3) requires the Commission to assess.

3. Fire service is not addressed. The letter covers water and wastewater only. Fire protection is the subject of this review, and the draft records that Lompoc Fire is the closest fire resource to many surrounding unincorporated areas and may be dispatched first (page 259).

4. Growth is continuing. The letter describes the Village as near build-out. Seven months later, the County approved an 87-room hotel and 60 apartments on a 5.16-acre parcel in the Village's commercial core (above).

This recommendation asks the Commission to record the City's planned areas and begin a sphere update with the findings and environmental review the law requires; it does not ask the Commission to adopt an expansion at this hearing. The district's objections are aimed at an expansion; they are not a reason to leave the City's plan out of the record.

Requests. The draft should:

1. Record the City's letter and Exhibit A map in the Lompoc profile, and list each area as a Lompoc sphere study area, as Table I-1 already does for Bodger Meadow.

2. State as findings, in this fire, law enforcement and emergency medical service review, what the draft already reports: Lompoc Fire is the closest fire resource to many of the surrounding unincorporated areas and may be dispatched first under automatic aid (page 259); the City treats Vandenberg Village's sewage (page 258); and the City's landfill takes waste from Mission Hills, Mesa Oaks and Vandenberg Village (page 259). These go to the need for services, the City's capacity to serve and communities of interest, which Government Code 56425(e)(2)–(4) requires the Commission to determine.

3. Begin updating Lompoc's sphere now. Resolution 26-08 (May 7, 2026) reaffirmed Lompoc's sphere without new findings; it incorporated determinations from service reviews dating from 2021 to 2025. Neither the resolution nor its staff report mentions the City's December 17, 2025 letter, and the resolution does not mention Vandenberg SFB's growth, though the Air Force's launch decision (October 2025) and the base's workforce projection (April 2026) were both public by then (see Sources). Since May, the County has approved development in the areas the City has asked to plan for. The Commission should begin a Lompoc sphere update now, using the City's letter and map as study areas, rather than waiting for the January 2031 cycle set in Resolution 26-08. The City's letter, map and General Plan update (adoption hearing scheduled for October 2028) are its work toward the annexation plan the resolution requires.

4. Name the Sustainable Agricultural Land Conservation grant study and the Memorandum of Agreement framework as the process for resolving the conflict between agricultural protection and growth that drove the 2023 denial.

5. Acknowledge the statutory path the City will follow: a City–County meeting before application (56425(b)), the Commission's written determinations (56425(e)), and environmental review before hearing (56428(b)). Under 56425(b)–(c), a City–County agreement on the sphere is given great weight.

Related corrections. River Park: the draft lists "River Bend Park and River Park (290+ acres)" as already within the sphere (page 259). The City's December 17, 2025 letter lists only River Bend Park (290+ acres) as within the sphere, and Exhibit A shows River Park, a separate area, as an area to be added. The draft should remove River Park from its list of areas already within the sphere. Mission Hills: the draft's disadvantaged-community label is not supported by Census or state data for Mission Hills and its census tracts (2.4); left uncorrected, it would wrongly restrict annexation next to one of the City's planned areas.

Sources

Draft and Commission records

- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, 2026 Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update: Agencies Providing Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, Crime & Safety and Emergency Medical Services in Santa Barbara County, Public Review Draft, October 23, 2026
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Notice of 21-Day Public Review and Intent to Adopt, dated November 12, 2026 (provided by Council Member Bridge): review period November 5 to December 8, 2026; comments due 5:00 p.m. December 7; hearing December 10, 2026
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Information Item 1, service review status presentation, September 3, 2026 (30-day public comment period; public hearing December 2026)
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Resolution 26-08, reaffirming the sphere of influence for the City of Lompoc, adopted May 7, 2026 (Ayes 6; signed by Chair Stark, attested by the Commission Clerk)
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Consent Calendar Item No. 3, Bailey Avenue resolution for denial (Application 22-07), April 6, 2023
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Information Item 7, out-of-agency service agreement status report, October 5, 2023
- Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Barbara County, Information Item 3, 2022 association white paper on 56133(e), presented March 2, 2023

Statutes and regulations

- Government Code 56076 (definition of sphere of influence)
- Government Code 56133
- Government Code 56133.5 (pilot program, Napa and San Bernardino commissions only)
- Government Code 56425, subdivisions (a), (b), (c), (e) and (g)
- Government Code 56428 (2025 Code)
- Government Code 56375
- Government Code 26909
- Water Code 79505.5
- Assembly Bill 473 (Chapter 614, Statutes of 2021), Public Records Act recodification

- California Department of Industrial Relations, Title 8, section 5144, Respiratory Protection, subsection (g)(4)

City of Lompoc documents

- City of Lompoc, letter to the Local Agency Formation Commission Executive Director re City of Lompoc Sphere of Influence, December 17, 2025 (Council Item No. 14, Attachment 1; provided by Council Member Bridge)
- City of Lompoc, Exhibit A, Proposed Sphere of Influence map (Item No. 14, Attachment 1; provided by Council Member Bridge)
- City of Lompoc, Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, fiscal year ended June 30, 2025: General Fund statement, management discussion, Notes 7 and 11, pension and retiree-health schedules
- City of Lompoc, 2030 General Plan, Introduction (provided by Council Member Bridge)
- City of Lompoc, Planning Commission staff report, October 9, 2013, 2030 General Plan Phase 1
- City of Lompoc, Resolution 6721(24), Housing Element re-adoption and Resolution 6776(25), Land Use and Noise Element amendments (preamble records Safety Element amendments adopted September 2, 2025)
- City of Lompoc, Housing Element page (2,248 units)
- City of Lompoc, General Plan and environmental impact reports schedule, 2026–2028, presented to the City Council (file dated January 16, 2026; provided by Council Member Bridge)
- Lompoc Police Department, Jail Manual, 2021 and 2025 draft

Other public agencies and data

- Vandenberg Village Community Services District, letter to the Commission re Business Item No. 2, Confirm City SOIs, April 28, 2026
- Vandenberg Village Community Services District, Wastewater User Ordinance, draft 2.19, section 2.20
- Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Order R3-2022-0004, waste discharge requirements for the City of Lompoc Regional Wastewater Reclamation Plant, adopted February 17, 2022 (cover page, discharger information)
- Department of the Air Force, Notice of Record of Decision, Falcon Launch Program at Vandenberg Space Force Base, Federal Register, December 8, 2025 (decision signed October 10, 2025)
- U.S. Space Force, “VSFB achieves historic milestone with 51 launches in 2024”

- Lompoc Unified School District, Workforce Housing for District Employees (board actions, eligibility, entitlement path)
- Census QuickFacts, California median household income 2020–2024
- U.S. Census Bureau, table B19013, 2020–2024 American Community Survey 5-year, California places, retrieved November 22, 2026; state figure $99,122 ± $310
- U.S. Census Bureau, table B19013, 2020–2024, Santa Barbara County places (confirms Mission Hills place 0648186 is in Santa Barbara County)
- California Department of Water Resources, Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool: Census place, tract and block-group layers for 2014–2018, 2016–2020 and 2019–2023 (for example, 2019–2023 place layer), queried November 22, 2026
- California Department of Justice, Crimes and Clearances context and definitions, June 2024
- Santa Barbara County Fire, unadopted 2025 Fire Code ordinance (blank ordinance number), Section 15-1
- 2019-20 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury, detention facilities report (Lompoc City Jail)
- Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office, Northern Branch Jail opening
- Contra Costa County Operational Area, two-in/two-out policy citing 29 CFR 1910.134 and Title 8 section 5144
- Santa Barbara County Assessor's Map Book 097, Page 37 (parcel 72, 5.16± acres; provided by Council Member Bridge)
- OpenStreetMap routing (Open Source Routing Machine public service, router.project-osrm.org), driving distances from Lompoc, Santa Maria and Buellton city halls to the Vandenberg Space Force Base main gate, queried November 22, 2026

News reports

- Santa Barbara Independent, American Medical Response contract, February 12, 2025, and contract terms
- Santa Barbara Independent, "Santa Barbara County's Adopted Housing Element Certified by State," January 23, 2024
- Noozhawk, "Regional Panel Formally Rejects Lompoc's Bailey Avenue Expansion Plan" (6–1 vote)
- KCBX, "Lompoc to review large scale housing proposal as county begins environmental study," July 6, 2026

- KEYT, “State of Vandenberg 2026: More Launches, More Outreach, Strong Future,” March 12, 2026 (71 launches in 2025)
- Noozhawk, 2026 Santa Maria Valley Housing Summit, April 2, 2026 (Space Launch Delta 30 executive director on workforce, off-base share and on-base housing)
- Noozhawk, “Lompoc School District Selects Development Team for Workforce Housing Project,” February 18, 2026
- Santa Maria Times, “Lompoc Unified continues negotiations for workforce housing at Maple High site” (200-unit concept, unit mix)
- Edhat, Vandenberg Village hotel and apartment approval (Board of Supervisors, November 17, 2026)
- Santa Barbara News-Press, County Notebook: board approves 60 apartments and 87 hotel rooms in Vandenberg Village, November 17, 2026