

BALDWIN HILLS CSD  
COMMUNITY ADVISORY PANEL (CAP) MEETING  
January 22, 2026

**A. Call to Order - 6:01 PM**

David McNeill, Chair

**B. Approval of Agenda - Agenda approved.**

**C. Regional Planning/ECC Update**

- DRAFT 2026 Drilling, Re-drilling, Well Abandonment, and Well Pad Restoration Plan (Baldwin Hills Community Standards District, Section 310.050.Z.3 ) – The document was briefly discussed and attendees were asked if they had any questions on the Plan. The 2026 Plan only includes plugging and abandonment of wells and no new drilling.
- 2025 Special Status Species Compliance Annual Report (Baldwin Hills Community Standards District, Sections 22.310.050.G.2 through 050.G.8) – The document was briefly discussed. There were questions about brush clearance for fire protection and about the coyote population in the oil field.

**D. Operators Report – Joe Walters**

- 4 Maintenance Rigs
  - 2 on production wells
  - 2 on Injector wells
- 0 Workover Rigs
  - 0 on production wells
  - 0 on injection wells
  - 0 on Plug and Abandonments
- Plug and Abandonments
  - No abandonments currently in process.
  - P&A Applications, i.e., Notice of Intentions (NOIs), have been submitted to CalGEM for approval.
- The Operator explained that due to the rains they have had to do treating, testing and releasing water from the retention basins.

**E. Open Discussion**

- A question was raised regarding a New York Times Article regarding federal litigation by the Trump administration to overturn the setbacks passed in California through SB 1137, and whether it would affect the oil field. It would appear that the lawsuit only applies to the drilling in federal lands (BLM managed wells) within the State.
- A question was asked about the status of the revisions to the Community Standards District and the Draft EIR. There was also a question about ongoing litigation by the Operator against the County. LA County planning said no additional information regarding the lawsuit is available at this time. There is also no update on the amendments to the CSD.
- There was a comment expressing difficulty when reading the complaint reports and suggested changes made to make it easier for the public to digest the information in those reports. The operator explained that sometimes the location given in complaint reports are general or vague and explained that complaint investigations are conducted as well as possible with the estimated locations

provided along with the procedures and equipment utilized. It was explained that the complaint are for the November complaint was near Kenneth Hahn State Park.

- There was a question about what a stuffing box is. The operator explained the intersection between the metal rod that goes into the stuffing box which is basically a large O-ring that a well rod enters in and out of.
- A motion was made by an attendee to put the spill prevention plan report up for discussion. MRS explained that the report was online on the LA County Planning website and placed a link in the chat. A request was made that it be emailed to all CAP members and that the document be brought up and discussed by the entire group at the next meeting. The SPCC was presented at a previous CAP meeting in September and is available in the County's web site.
- A request for a continuous update of action items be added to the meeting minutes as opposed to a summary typed. MRS indicated that the minutes for meetings include information that memorialize the discussions at the CAP meeting and action items. LA Planning added that County planning has provided a summary sheet of relevant/related state laws in the past. CalGEM has been invited to attend the CAP meetings, and Planning will reach out again.
- Public Health indicated that the researchers from the UCLA study were unable to attend as previously requested. To keep up on the UCLA studies DPH provided a link for CAP members to view and address any questions.
- A comment was made thanking SPR for addressing the question regarding subsidized parking, and the fishing club.
- A question was raised again regarding the age of the Packard tank farm. MRS indicated that one of them is approximately 12 years old but that there was no age requirement and tested for their integrity regularly. The operator indicated that there was no requirement to track the age of the tank but that they were regularly tested via ultrasonic testing.
- A comment was made indicating that tank testing is included in public reports as part of the CalGEM website.

#### **F. Approval of Minutes**

- December minutes were approved.

Next CAP Meeting February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2026, On-Line meeting.

Adjourn: 7:07.