

Baldwin Hills Community Standards District (CSD)
Community Advisory Panel (CAP)
Minutes: 10/25/12
FINAL

A. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00PM

B. AGENDA – Approved

C. EVENOR MASIS & CARRIE TAYOUR, L.A. COUNTY – DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH
PRESENTATION: NOISE MONITORING ACTIVITIES AT THE INGLEWOOD OIL FIELD

Evenor Masis described in detail his background, his role within the Dept. of Public Health (DPH), and his more than 18 years of experience in public health and environmental science. With his assistance, DPH and Regional Planning developed the Baldwin Hills CSD noise provisions during the drilling moratorium (2008-2009). He outlined DPH general functions under Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations for CSD provisions, and illustrated the protocol followed for investigating reported complaints each month.

The Quiet Mode Drilling Plan (QMDP) provides certain limitations on oil operational activities on the field during the night-time periods. The methodology that Public Health utilizes for noise monitoring includes random sampling and analysis of the on-site instrument recordings at various points within the surrounding communities around the oil field. The monitors capture every single noise on the field continuously with readings on five-second (5s) intervals, and that more than 30,000 data points are generated within any 12-month period. Noise data is observed monthly by DPH field inspectors on randomly chosen dates, at additional sites surrounding the field, coincidental to the noise monitors deployed by PXP. The machine readers employed by the DPH field inspectors responds to measurements of +/- 3 dBA, and also registers changes by only 1 dBA.

Given the quantity and quality of noise data within this array, Evenor Masis reports that the noise levels observed during the QMDP and overnight periods have consistently been below the 45 dBA Leq nighttime noise limit, on average. He stated that the prevailing noise source for the field is traffic: PXP's contribution to the noise of the area is miniscule in comparison to the constant traffic on the surrounding roadways and background ambience. He maintains that monitoring for 1 dBA is not practical because that small energy change can't be characterized to a specific noise source. Only three (3) times per year have any incidents been reported, even during drilling activities. He also indicated that his resources within the Environmental Hygiene Program are rather limited, with only two staff personnel for these monitoring efforts, and have additional priorities other than measuring redundancies within the current Noise Monitoring Plan, which is working as intended.

D. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS BY CAP MEMBERS AND THE PUBLIC

Paul Ferrazzi questioned the QMDP/overnight noise levels being reported as equal to 45 dBA Leq on average, when the data in the presentation slide described the levels as less than or equal to 45 dBA Leq on average. John Kuechle clarified that the data indicated that 65 dBA Leq measurements at the interior of the field were reduced to up to 45 dBA Leq at the exterior end of the noise source, and as isolated from the background noise included in the analytical sample. Evenor Masis stated that the various monitoring sites were chosen closest to targets using GPS, and within L.A. County. Gary Gless stated that sound travels upward toward the surrounding communities, and believed the goal of the noise monitoring was to capture environmental noise from the field. He questioned the monitor placement locations, stating they should be positioned closer to the residential properties. Evenor Masis responded that it is important to capture all data impacts from the field, including ambient traffic, and that noises dissipate from noise sources as it travels off the field into the community. Some of the monitoring locations were chosen with ease of use in mind.

A member of the general public inquired if the ambient background noises were statistically random different traffic noises or included singular disruptions such as police or ambulance sirens, for example. Evenor Masis replied that noise distribution comparisons are not-related, like apples to oranges. The noise is recorded direct from non-specific noise sources. Evenor Masis stated that the noises from the field include metal-on-metal contacts from drilling operations. In response to question from the general public regarding any reported noises from fracturing operations, Evenor Masis stated that the overall change in noise from the field overall is only 2-3 dBA, as measured on a logarithmic scale, and is barely perceptible to the hearing of an average observer. Compare the 2-3

dBA of such an operation to the background and community noise which nearly approaches the 65 dBA significance threshold.

Jon Melvin inquired why no sound-walls are used on the field to mitigate the impact of the traffic noises. Evenor Masis stated that the waves of traffic noise completely drown out any noises that PXP may contribute; that sensitivity analyses and scientific techniques demonstrate that. All data points for traffic are in 3-second intervals. George Mallory questioned if the recordings distinguish intermittent traffic noise in comparison to the constant noises produced by PXP. Evenor Masis clarified that the traffic is constant throughout the night, except after the 10 – 11 PM time period at which a drop in the ambience traffic is noticeable. Also during nighttime hours, there are 2-5 minute intervals for aircraft noises near LAX airport at the half hour and hour peaks.

Carrie Tayour presented data previously provided from the Community Survey findings illustrating that respondents are more concerned for other common noise sources in the Baldwin Hills community than noise generated by oil operations at the Inglewood oil field, and by a wide margin. Paul Ferrazzi questioned if thirty (30) total complaints to date were truly representative of the approximately 150,000 community residents surrounding the oil field. Evenor Masis responded that while there were 30 complaints: 28 were unsubstantiated, 1 was an unjustified complaint of humming noise and vibration not attributable to the oil field, and 1 from 2011 was a justified noise complaint, however the noise levels measured during that incident were well below the level of significance.

Jon Melvin reported that clanking can be heard from the oil field during periods of peak noise. Evenor Masis stated there are inherent limitations associated with the County Noise Ordinance; however, to increase the protection factor to the surrounding communities, different health standards are also applied in the analytical process and the assessment is not limited to the PXP noise standard. John Kuechle observed that the noise complaints for 2012 are less than the number reported in the previous years, and trending downward. Evenor Masis clarified that data did not include any of the complaints recorded in the 2012 Complaint Log for the 3rd Quarter. However, the number of complaints appears to be decreasing.

Paul Ferrazzi questioned if the noise monitors located near both on-site flares (the new installation, and the back-up), as well as the gas plant would continue to be monitored by DPH against future need for such noise source data. Luis Perez clarified that noise monitors for point sources are positioned closer to the drill rig, not near the field boundaries.

George Mallory requested further information detailing oil field investigations conducted by DPH field inspectors. Evenor Masis stated that the inspectors for the environmental hygiene program investigate non-specific complaints that PXP received, and forwarded to DPH. Inspectors are not emergency responders to specific individual complaints. Evenor Masis provided direct contact information for the Toxics-Epidemiology Program (telephone and email).

E. REGIONAL PLANNING UPDATE

DRP is in communication with Sonoma Technology, Inc. (STI) regarding their instrument deployment schedule for the next two months. Luis Perez reported that the accumulated soil that was a subject of questions at the last CAP meeting was found to be bioremediated soil being used for beneficial uses within the field. He also stated that an AQMD investigation was ongoing, but that a Notice of Violation/Notice to Comply was issued to PXP on October 19th related to the bioremediation sites. Drilling is set to resume in mid to late November.

F. OPERATOR UPDATE

Lisa Paillet reported that four re-work rigs were on-site. She stated that the 2012 Annual Community meeting had occurred on October 15th, with good turnout of community representatives, and bodes well for continued outreach in the future. PXP will be posting the FAQs/Q&A on their website soon. PXP re-submitted the Landscaping Plans for Phase 3 through 5, to depict fewer trees planned in some areas along the public right of way as requested by DPW. The 3rd Quarter 2012 Groundwater report has been posted on the Inglewood oil field website.

Six (6) total complaints were recorded on the 2012 Complaint Log for the 3rd Quarter: Noise (3), Odor (1), Property damage (1), and multiple/various (1). Lisa Paillet informed that there was an on-going investigation of the bio-farms being pursued by AQMD, and that a Notice of Violation had been issued.

In response to questions asked of the ombudsperson at the previous CAP meeting, Lisa Paillet stated that no new wells are proposed for re-abandonment at this time; that wells re-abandoned in 2012 were in accordance with new DOGGR requirements; no Area of Review (AoR) is currently being pursued at this time; and that either clean or recycled rainwater is used for fugitive dust mitigation on the field. She also stated that PXP has purchased water from both Cal American and Golden State in the past, and will inquire with PXP staff whether Golden State is supplying water to the oil field currently. She reported that no drilling is taking place at this time on the field, as evidenced by less truck and personnel activity, but purchased water is not only used for drilling activities. Paul Ferrazzi stated that likely scenarios for increased water usage would include operation of drilling, re-drilling, and re-working rigs.

G. CAP/OPEN DISCUSSION

A member of the general public inquired when some sections of the DRP website would be completed, to include background information and FAQs. Rena Kambara described some of the information that is being added to the website, and agreed that the website needs to be updated. She stated that the Documents tab of the DRP website had been updated to include the response letter from the EPA.

Paul Ferrazzi inquired when both DRP/DPW will finalize their collaborative efforts regarding the ground movement surveys, and the process to substantiate residential property damage claims. Rena Kambara responded that DPW had provided a letter to PXP regarding their continuing efforts to provide additional data.

In response to a question from the general public regarding the Hydraulic Fracturing Study: Luis Perez stated that no further action by L.A. County is warranted with regard to the Hydraulic Fracturing Study, as prescribed in the 2011 Settlement Agreement. All questions or comments previously submitted may have been addressed within the report, but no individual responses were sent to the individuals that proposed their inclusion to the study. The general public member also inquired if there were any implications on fracturing (fracking) since the Hydraulic Fracturing Study was released, and whether any applications for fracking permits would be required for wells proposed in the 2013 Annual Drilling Plan. Luis Perez stated that the Annual Drilling Plan does not preclude the use of fracking, and that currently, there is no regulatory action or permit issued for fracking activities by the County. He also stated that fracking is not within the purview of DRP or L.A. County, but with DOGGR which is in the process of drafting such regulations subsequent to their workshop tours. There is no notification process by which PXP must inform DRP or other agencies (except DOGGR) that fracking will be conducted at all. Lisa Paillet asserted that the operator has no current plan to perform fracking on any of their wells at this time.

Paul Ferrazzi inquired why no data from the Horn River study was included in the Hydraulic Fracturing study. Mr. Ferrazzi shared a copy of the study with DRP.

A member of the general public questioned the impartiality of the peer reviewer to the Hydraulic Fracturing Study performed by Cardno/Entrix. He also inquired if there were any recourse, actionable process, or critique that could be pursued since the perceived conflict of the peer reviewer invalidated the findings of the study, by having prior involvement with the oil and gas industry. Luis Perez stated that it is difficult to find peer reviewers that are not involved with the oil and gas industries in some fashion: most have worked within the industries to acquire their expertise. Luis Perez suggested that the general public could submit letters to DRP. In response, John Kuechle called for a motion of the CAP to send a letter requesting that the County explain the selection process for the peer reviewer. The motion was seconded and was passed.

Settlement Agreement compliance letters were sent by DRP to the Petitioners in July 2012, and responses have been received. Carol Schwab, for Culver City, stated that the City believes that two additional wells may need to be considered for supplements due to their locations. Lisa Paillet agreed to investigate the matter, and will provide a response at the next CAP.

H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: (9/27/12) – Approved
(7/26/12) – Approved with changes

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- - Next CAP Meeting will be December 6th, at 7:00PM

J. ADJOURN – 9:00 PM

ATTENDANCE: 10/25/12

(*absent)

DESIGNATED SEATS PER 22.44.142.J.1.a***Governmental Entities***

1	Department of Regional Planning	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 & Production	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	Jeff Dritley (Roger Shockley)
6	Cone Fee Family Trust	Liz Gosnell

Neighborhood Organizations (Recognized Homeowners Association)

7	Ladera Heights Civic Assoc.	Carmen Spiva
8	Windsor Hills HOA	Gary Gless
9	United HOA (View Park)	Catherine Cottles (Phyllis Hall)
10	Culver Crest Neighborhood Assoc.	John Kuechle
11	Blair Hills HOA	Jon Melvin
12	Raintree Community HOA	Ian Cousineau
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	Gwendolyn Flynn (Mark Glassock)
20	Baldwin Hills Conservancy	David McNeill*
21	The City Project	Robert Garcia (Ramya Sivasubramanian)

Evenor Masis, Carrie Tayour (DPH)
 Luis Perez, Ray Mullins (DRP Consultants)
 Tim Stapleton (DRP)