

Baldwin Hills Community Standards District (CSD)
Community Advisory Panel (CAP)
Minutes: 4/25/2013
DRAFT

- A. CALL TO ORDER – 7:02PM
- B. AGENDA – Approved
- C. PRESENTATION: DRP discussion of the process for the upcoming comprehensive CSD Periodic Review.

Rena Kambara briefly described the CSD Periodic Review and the requirements within the CSD to perform the periodic review.

Luis Perez continued the discussion of the CSD Periodic Review. He described the CSD provisions regarding the five-year review requirement and provided a handout depicting a proposed overview of the periodic review flowchart. He explained that the next CAP meeting will center around obtaining input from the CAP about CSD issues and concerns the CAP would like to see addressed in the periodic review. In addition, within the next week, an electronic survey will be set up on the County's website for the public to provide input regarding issues and concerns to be reviewed.

Mr. Perez explained that there will be a two-pronged approach to the periodic review. The first involves a comprehensive analysis, while the second involves a review of technological advances. Regarding the comprehensive analysis, complaint logs, EQAP audits, enforcement actions, operations and maintenance records, CSD studies, and MACC agency records will be reviewed. A MACC meeting will try to be held prior to the next CAP meeting. Regarding the review of technological advances, the periodic review will determine whether there are industry standards that have occurred over the past four years that should be taken advantage of that can now be used to amend provisions of the CSD. Mr. Perez further explained that in reviewing the CSD, implementation of the CSD provisions may be analyzed as well as interpretation of the CSD provision language. As an example, he discussed the quarterly complaint log provision, which has been interpreted to require a handwritten log, but could be revisited to allow for a more manageable electronic log. Lastly, changes in the actual language of the CSD provisions will be considered.

Paul Ferrazzi asked for clarification on what will constitute review of enforcement actions; that is, County actions only or also MACC agency records and enforcement violations. Mr. Perez replied that the review will include everything that is within the purview of the County. Mr. Ferrazzi asked if all the County's obligations to the CSD will be reviewed and expressed his concern that the Public Work's geologist who reviewed the ground movement survey stated that he didn't have the background to conduct the analysis. Mr. Ferrazzi stated he believed this was a failure on the part of the County under its obligation of duty of care to the community. Mr. Perez reiterated that all provisions under the purview of the County will be reviewed.

David McNeill asked who the point person for the project would be. Mr. Perez stated that Ms. Kambara will be the point of contact. Ms. Kambara added that since the CSD falls under Title 22 of the County ordinance, it falls under the responsibility of the DRP.

John Melvin asked if the role of the CAP and its powers rights will be looked at in the CSD periodic review. Mr. Perez responded that it would if that is something desired by the CAP.

Mr. Ferrazzi suggested that MRS should review past CAP minutes to determine what issues were raised.

Mr. McNeill stated that the electronic survey should be designed in the best way possible to allow people to convey their concerns. Mr. Perez clarified that the electronic survey will not be multiple choice, but designed in as simple a way possible to allow users to provide detailed input.

Mr. Ferrazzi wanted to make sure that the electronic survey allows for users to include issues that are not part of the CSD, but that the community believes should be part of the CSD. Mr. Perez said it would allow for these items, but expressed the need for people to understand that some issues brought up may be outside of the county's jurisdictional responsibility. He then provided the issue of fracking as a reminder that the CSD does have limitations as fracking falls under DOGGR's jurisdiction.

Gary Gless asked if the CAP members could review the survey comments received. Mr. Perez replied that all comments will be available as part of the initial draft report released to the public. He then explained the additional opportunities that will be available for comment and public review of response to comments. He added that all issues raised in the comments will try to be addressed; however, as stated, there may be limitations, such as legal or other limiting factors.

John Kuechle stated the role and process by which CAP deals with issues needs to be reviewed and ironed out, especially the hearing officer appointed by the Director of the DRP. Mr. Perez stated that it is his understanding that the hearing officer is the person who passes on the report with recommendations to the County Board of Supervisors, if needed.

Mr. Kuechle and Mr. Perez discussed the timing allowed for the CAP to provide review and comments as delineated in the flowchart handed out. Mr. Perez stated the review will be structured to allow adequate time for CAP review within the constraints of the need to complete the periodic review in a timely fashion.

A member of the public requested clarification on the CAP's role in the decision making process regarding fracking. Mr. Perez stated that the CSD did not include fracking provisions mainly due to it not being under the jurisdiction of the County and that the state was in the process of regulating fracking via new DOGGR regulations and via new legislation. The same member of the public suggested that the legislative process for approving fracking be better understood by the CAP and explained to their constituents.

Mark Glasscock agreed that MRS should review previous CAP minutes to identify issues. He also requested that the electronic survey be available in paper form for those who do not have internet access. Mr. Perez replied that prior attempts for paper surveys in this project yielded few to no returns, but added that any paper surveys submitted would be accepted and incorporated into the review and response to comments. Mr. Glasscock asked if there would be a scan of relevant or similar issues nationwide during the review period. Mr. Perez said there would.

A member of the public asked if the Director of Public Health was informed about providing input as to whether or not a health survey is necessary. Ms. Kambara stated that the Director of Public Health was informed and the County is awaiting their response. The same member of the public asked who the hearing officer would be. Mr. Perez and Ms. Kambara stated they did not know at this time.

A member of the public asked if the issue of whether to approve fracking was finalized and if there is oversight. Mr. McNeill replied that the issue has not been resolved, but that fracking in the field has been done in the past and attempts to frac in the field will occur in the future. Mr. Perez added that a couple of wells were fracked as part of a fracking study recently conducted. He clarified that no high volume, high pressure hydraulic fracturing is currently occurring in the field, DOGGR is putting together regulations, AQMD recently put in place new regulations, and a number of competing bills addressing fracking are currently in the State legislature.

A member of the public suggested that a public presentation be provided in order to bring people up to speed on the CSD and related issues.

A member of the public asked how the public will know the electronic survey is available without public noticing. She also stated that 30 days would not be enough time to respond and agreed that a public presentation would be useful. Mr. Perez restated the number and timing of public meetings, mentioned the responsibility of the CAP to inform their constituents, and stated that the County will be sending out an email to those on the mailing list. Mr. McNeill emphasized that every effort should be made by both the CAP organizations and the County to inform people of the electronic survey. Regarding the distribution list, Ms. Kambara clarified it is comprised of CAP members and several hundred community members who have signed up. She said that she would look into using a more expansive list, such as 2nd District's distribution list. Lisa Paillet stated that the CAP should follow its function

to disseminate information to the different embers of the neighborhood groups as described in the CSD. She added that the CAP members are responsible to inform their communities.

Mr. Perez continued his presentation on the CSD Periodic Review process and explained the remainder of the flowchart. Ms. Kambara emphasized that the review of the draft report is the most important part of the process for public review. Mr. Perez reiterated that the next CAP meeting will be an opportunity to provide input into the process and clarified questions regarding the proposed timeline.

Mr. Melvin suggested that input received on the review process be summarized and placed on the County's website, and the survey be available for download in pdf format. He also suggested that the County provide an outreach blurb for CAP members to distribute to their constituents.

Mr. Kuechle suggested that the CAP members summarize their initial concerns in ten words or less. His list included expansion of the CAP's role and fracking regulations. He added that the County should have a more reasonable interpretation of the bonding and insurance requirements that are already in the CSD. Mr. McNeill added to the list public comment and public input notification scheduling, i.e., 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, and actionable remedial steps resulting from the ground movement survey. He also mentioned checks and balances clarification on the decision-making process. Mr. Glassock added to the list clarification of the necessity of the health survey. Mr. Melvin added to the list a resolution process for citizen's impacted by oil field activities.

Mr. Glassock stated that the proposed timeline does not allow enough time for the neighborhood organizations to include the review process on their agendas. Mr. Perez stated that in developing the proposed timeline, every effort was made to address those concerns.

Mr. McNeill stated efforts will be made by the County to ensure that documents to be made available online are readable.

D. QUESTIONS FROM CAP AND PUBLIC

Questions were recorded in the previous discussion.

E. REGIONAL PLANNING/ECC UPDATE

Ms. Kambara stated that Sonoma Technology is still collecting air quality data, there are no new issues, and they are tentatively scheduled to deploy their proton transfer reaction time of flight mass spectrometer in mid to late June.

Mr. Perez stated that the trucking of the VOC-contaminated soils was completed last Friday. He described the recent fire caused by a downed SCE line (not on PXP's property) that spread to a small portion of the oil field, but was contained.

F. OPERATOR UPDATE

Ms. Paillet stated that 11 wells have been drilled since the beginning of 2013, 4 workover rigs are currently operating in the field, the first quarter ground water monitoring report has been posted, there were nine complaints in the first quarter comprising five noise complaints, three odor complaints, and one property damage complaint. Removal of contaminated dirt from the biofarms was completed last Friday. She provided an update on the company's merger. She discussed the status of the video taken by Mr. Gless. She discussed the status of the ground movement survey's pdf document that was not legible due to watermarks. She asked for suggestions on how to make the oil field website more user friendly.

Mr. Kuechle stated that by not providing the CAP with legible documents, PXP is not complying with the CSD.

Mr. Ferrazzi asked whether actual drilling has followed the drilling plan order. Ms. Paillet stated that the order has changed and the map is updated prior to the CAP meetings, but the schedule is not updated. She said she will look into providing the drilling dates on the map. Mr. Kuechle asked if the County approves changes to the drilling

plan order and how the County ensures that the provision not allowing a certain number of wells to be drilled in a closely related area is followed. Mr. Perez said that MRS is aware of the changes and makes sure the changes comply with provisions of the CSD.

Ms. Paillet clarified that the dirt removed from the biofarms was over 50 ppm.

G. PUBLIC COMMENT

A member of the public asked for clarification on what 50 ppm meant. Ms. Paillet replied that she was referring to Volatile Organic Compounds or VOCs over 50 parts per million.

A member of the public announced that Culver City has released draft proposed regulations for the part of the oil field located in Culver City. She said the document is posted online and public comment is welcome.

A member of the public expressed concern related to earlier comments regarding the Department of Public Health's response to the DRP's request for input. Ms. Kambara detailed her communication with the Department of Public Health. The same member of the public asked if the CAP can recommend in the CSD a baseline study of below ground conditions. Mr. McNeill stated that it could be part of the CSD review process.

H. CAP/OPEN DISCUSSION

Questions were recorded in previous discussions.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

(2/28/13) – Not approved. Awaiting proposed language amendments from CAP members.

(3/21/13) – Approved with minor edits suggested by Mr. Gless.

J. ANNOUNCEMENTS: Next CAP scheduled for 5/23/2013.

K. ADJOURN – 8:57PM

ATTENDANCE: 4/25/13
 (*absent)

DESIGNATED SEATS PER 22.44.142.J.1.a

Governmental Entities

1	Department of Regional	Rena Kambara
2	City of Culver City	Paul Ferrazzi
3	West Los Angeles College	Nabil Abu-Ghazaleh*

Operator (per 22.44.142.C)

4	Plains Exploration &	Lisa Paillet
---	----------------------	--------------

NOMINATED SEATS PER 22.44.142.J.1.a

(Accepted first-come/first-served within each sub-group)

Landowners (per 22.44.142.C)

5	Vickers Family Trust	Roger Shockley*
6	Cone Fee Family Trust	Nancy Snowden

Neighborhood Organizations (Recognized Homeowners Association)

7	Ladera Heights Civic Assoc.	Rene Talbott
8	Windsor Hills HOA	Gary Gless
9	United HOA (View Park)	Ruth Oates
10	Culver Crest Neighborhood	John Kuechle
11	Blair Hills HOA	Jon Melvin
12	Raintree Community HOA	Mark Didak
13	Baldwin Hills Estates HOA	Ronda Jones*

Neighborhood Organizations (No Recognized Homeowners Association)

14	Ladera Crest Homeowner	George Mallory*
15	Baldwin Vista Homeowner	Irma Munoz*

School Districts

16	Los Angeles Unified	Glenn Striegler*
17	Culver City Unified	Scott Zeidman*

Neighborhood Organizations (All Others)

18	Windsor Hills Block Club	Toni Tabor
19	Community Health Councils	Mark Glassock
20	Baldwin Hills Conservancy	David McNeill
21	The City Project	Ramya Sivasubramanian

Luis Perez, Michael Cassata (DRP Consultants)
 Timothy Stapleton (DRP)