Baldwin Hills Community Standards District (CSD)
Community Advisory Panel (CAP)
Minutes: 8/23/12
FINAL

A. CALL TO ORDER – 7:05PM

B. AGENDA – Approved

C. PRESENTATION: BALDWIN HILLS AIR QUALITY MONITORING STUDY
DR. PAUL ROBERTS & DAVID VAUGHN, SONOMA TECH, INC.

Sonoma Tech, Inc. (STI) is a Northern California firm with over 30 years of experience in air quality service. The primary purpose of the work plan in development is to measure prioritized air toxics emitted from the oil field into the surrounding communities. Multiple methods will be used to measure for Black Carbon, diesel particulate matter (DPM), metals, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Analysis will show oil field concentrations of these air toxics, as well as other external contributors, when comparing the basin to all of Los Angeles. The primary objective of the Air Quality Monitoring Study (set forth in the 2011 Settlement Agreement to the CSD) is to qualify acute and chronic exposure, quantify air toxics and emissions, and assign benchmarks. The second objective is to distinguish sources of emissions, and assess oil field operations to identify source contributions, such as vehicles and diesel engines. Using pollutant prioritization and appropriate measurement plans, STI will gather data, perform analysis, and present the final report to the CAP.

STI has identified 37 potential emissions currently occurring on the oil field, as stated within PXP emissions control program and inventory. Priority values were assigned based on specific emissions and their toxicity, and the top 13 pollutants were identified, when assessing for chronic cancer risk, based on both short-term and long-term referenced exposure levels. In response to a question from the public, Dr. Paul Roberts stated that methane is not a huge risk, would rank low on the list (below 150), and is not classified as a toxic by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). The prioritized list shows that the top pollutants are Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) and metals, and the location offers multiple sources of these pollutants (traffic congestion, freeways, airport, etc.) The EPA has not designated specific measurement programs for DPM; however, Black carbon measurements can be used as a correlation to DPM. STI will use four instruments on the oil field for one year, with data gathered at five minute intervals, 24 hours/day. Metals measurements are taken in short-term measurements using X-ray fluorescence (XRF) spectrometer, which can perform well in the field due to fine resolution interval wavelength. Carbonyls, VOCs, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) measurements will be made with a mass spectrometer, elemental mass separation, using PTR-TOFMS.

Meteorological conditions for the oil field change on a daily basis, as well as seasonally. Typical wind speed and direction is obtained from 2011 data from the Met Station. However, critical measurement factors (including the average time for data collection, site locating, monitoring period, whether “near/further away” sources) help to determine what emissions are blowing off the oil field into the communities. Therefore, it is important to frame the instruments on site. The siting criteria are listed within the plan, including proposed monitoring locations and logistics for instrument deployment.

D. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS BY CAP MEMBERS AND THE PUBLIC

Paul Ferrazzi inquired about possible sources for metals on the oil field. Dr. Roberts stated that metals mostly occur from drilling, drill bits, combustion, and fuel oils (not gasoline or less refined oil).

A member of the general public inquired about certifications of quality assurance and quality controls. Dr. Roberts stated that 10% of the total project budget has been allocated to quality control and quality assurance programs. Instrument calibration and data consolidation play a major role in assuring that instruments are working as intended, and that quality control activities are recorded. The quality control samples are collected every five minutes, double-checked by field personnel, in accordance with the quality control and audit programs in place. It is not possible to cheat the sample system, or fake the data results. When the data is analyzed, such attempts will be identified.

Gary Gless inquired why one of the proposed monitoring sites is on a ridge within the oil field, and not within the surrounding communities. Dr. Roberts stated that the basin is on a mid-gradient on average. Any toxic emissions originating within the oil field must pass over the ridge (in higher concentration) before the wind flowed from the field to the communities.

Paul Ferrazzi questioned if the proposed study will incorporate any complaints received by SCAQMD. Dr. Roberts stated that the study being conducted is not an odor study, as it is hard to quantify odors, most instruments not much better than the human nose; the AQMS is an air toxics study, designed to address toxic constraints in the RFP. Luis Perez clarified that odor issues are not necessarily emissions or pollutant issues, odor incidents could occur as part of upset conditions. A member of the general public stated that the wind flows off the field strongly over one proposed site, and inquired why no monitors were proposed at the individual wells, along oil/gas transport paths, or external to the oil field. Dr. Roberts stated that no access was sought from the public, and that the air quality monitoring study being performed is not a multi-million dollar case exposure study for the community. STI is measuring for toxic emissions from the oil field, and has no access to confidential data for the community. Gary Gless questioned sufficiency of data for the study. Dr. Roberts qualified that for oil fields and gas refineries: oil fields may be very popular but have not been well studied. In response to a question from the general public, Dr. Roberts stated that there is no established health assessment or risk for ultra-fines in near road research.

A member of the general public inquired about the data collection process. Dr. Roberts stated that gathering operational data and current process schedules is an ongoing development. Luis Perez clarified that all the data for drilling operations will be shared with STI, and corroborated to identify potential sources of pollutants that may be found in the monitoring study. Liz Gosnell asked how STI will distinguish DPM originated from the oil field, and not from street traffic (such as La Brea or La Cienega), or LAX airport. She stated that volume of pollutants from these sources were more concerning to her than any present on the oil field. Dr. Roberts replied that STI will ascribe air measurements during drilling activities, and agreed that obtaining existent data for LAX may be difficult. The study will attempt to quantify the contributions of these external factors (distance factors, atmospheric/ground sources, etc.). A member of the general public asked if massaged data will be released to the public, after the study is released. Dr. Roberts stated the summaries of the data analysis will be included in the final report, but not any raw/massaged data. Data collection is projected through February 2014, with analysis and reporting the following month. Examples of data analyses include risk characteristics, emission sources, spatial/temporal characterizations, pollutant concentrations along risk fingerprints. He also stated that subsequent peer review analysis, contracted through STI's university partners, and such data, can be made available to the public.

Gary Gless asked how much more funding would be needed for longer measurement durations for VOCs. Dr. Roberts stated that deployment of the monitoring instruments to be used in the study costs approximately $20,000 per week, and that STI inquired for additional funding from both AQMD and the EPA (both groups declined). The proposed study is intended to fulfill the expectations of the settlement agreement and ensure that objectives are being met. A member of the general public inquired when the final deadline for any additional funding could be acquired, and influence changes to the final work plan for the study. Dr. Roberts stated that any additional funds would need to be received by January 2013.

A member of the general public questioned if the technical science on which the study is based will stand up in five years. Dr. Roberts stated that their study could be the baseline/benchmark for subsequent studies. There is newer equipment available on the market; however, there are only approximately 20 people in the country currently using them at this time. Dr. Roberts stated that recommendations and next steps will be included in the final report.

Catherine Cottles questioned why passive sampling methods would not be used in the course of the study. Dr. Roberts stated that the spectrometer can acquire better data than sampling methods; however, some passive sampling is required for quality control and quality assurance. The presentation of the work plan will be uploaded to the DRP website, next week.

Paul Ferrazzi questioned if fluids or compounds used for fracking will be measured. Dr. Roberts stated that the study is not species specific for measurement, but should be seen in the data.

E. REGIONAL PLANNING/ECC UPDATE

Settlement Agreement Compliance 2012 will be postponed until the September CAP. Landscaping Plans for Phases 3, 4, and 5 have been revised by PXP and resubmitted.

F. OPERATOR UPDATE

Lisa Paillet stated that the 2012 Community Meeting will be held at Knox Presbyterian, on October 15, 2012. PXP consultants will be on hand to discuss the results and finding of the Fracking Diagnostic Study. No drilling currently on the field, however 8 workover rigs are on the field. The 2012 2nd Annual Ground Movement Survey, along with the Property Damage - Structural Assessment reports, were sent to both DPW, and DOGGR. The operator anticipates submitting the 2013 Annual Drilling Plan to DRP before Labor Day.

G. CAP/OPEN DISCUSSION

Paul Ferrazzi questioned if well VIC1-933 was fractured, since he noted that output seems higher. Lisa Paillet stated that even though a permit was approved by DOGGR, the well was not fractured.

H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Postponed

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next CAP Meeting will be September 27th, at 7:00PM

J. ADJOURN – 9:00 PM

ATTENDANCE: 8/23/12
*(*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	Rose Marie Joyce*

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 (Alternate)
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 (Alternate)
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 (Alternate)
20	Baldwin Hills Conservancy	David McNeill*
21	The City Project	Robert Garcia (Alternate)

Luis Perez, Ray Mullins (DRP Consultants)
Patricia Hachiya, Supervisor (DRP)