

Master Noise Nuisance Report

Noise Intrusion at 6176 Federal Blvd., San Diego — Sound-Level Recordings, Acoustic Analysis, Health Impact & Legal Framework

re: the 6144 Federal Blvd. FRAC / holding-tank and transfer-pump operation (United Rentals / Reliable Onsite Services)

Subject (receiving) property	6176 Federal Blvd., San Diego, CA 92114
Noise source	6144 Federal Blvd. — FRAC / holding-tank and transfer-pump operation (United Rentals / Reliable Onsite Services)
Evidence analyzed	Seven recordings: A.0 (2026-05-27), A.1 (2026-06-10), A.2 (2026-06-17), A.3 (2026-06-23), A.4 (2026-06-27), A.5 (2026-07-02), and source-off Baseline A (2026-06-23), with the clip-level technical assessments and the Davies Statement of Events.
Report date	2026-07-02 · this revision adds Clip A.5 (July 2, 2026) and supersedes the June 23, 2026 Master Noise Nuisance Report and Exhibits A.0–A.4.

READ FIRST — Scope and limits of this report. This report synthesizes uncalibrated audio/video recordings, the applicable San Diego noise regulations, general California nuisance and negligence law, and the published health literature. It is prepared to help the property owner and counsel understand what the evidence does and does not show. It is not legal advice and not a substitute for a licensed acoustical engineer or a California attorney. The recordings cannot establish a sound-pressure level in decibels; the factual allegations about conversations and conduct are the complainant's account and have not been independently verified. Both points are explained in detail below.

Source Links

[\(A\) Baseline Audio/Video without Pumps Running \(A.0\) May 27, 2026, at 1534 Acoustical Analysis](#)

[\(A.1\) June 10, 2026, at 0600 Acoustical Analysis](#)

[\(A.2\) June 17, 2026, at 0600 Acoustical Analysis](#)

[\(A.3\) June 23, 2026, at 0550 Acoustical Analysis](#)

[\(A.4\) June 27, 2026, at 0400 Acoustical Analysis](#)

[\(A.5\) July 2, 2026, at 0250 Acoustical Analysis](#)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

At-a-Glance Summary

1. Purpose, Scope & Central Evidentiary Caveat
2. The Recordings and What Each One Shows
 - 2.1 Clip A.0 — May 27, 2026 (daytime rooftop video)
 - 2.2 Clip A.1 — June 10, 2026 (~6:00 a.m. interior)
 - 2.3 Clip A.2 — June 17, 2026 (6:00 a.m. interior WAV)
 - 2.4 Clip A.3 — June 23, 2026 (~5:50 a.m. interior)
 - 2.5 Clip A.4 — June 27, 2026 (~4:00 a.m. interior, pre-dawn)
 - 2.6 Clip A.5 — July 2, 2026 (~2:50 a.m. exterior video) [NEW]
 - 2.7 Baseline File A — June 23, 2026 (source-off reference)
 - 2.8 Reconciling the recordings

3. Side-by-Side Comparison and the Baseline Contrast
 4. What the Acoustic Evidence Establishes — and What It Cannot
 5. Open Factual Questions to Resolve Early
 6. Applicable San Diego Noise Framework
 7. California Nuisance & Negligence Framework (General Information)
 8. Known Adverse Medical and Task-Efficiency Effects
 9. The Complainant's Factual Narrative (Davies Statement)
 10. Landlord (Westport Properties) Considerations
 11. Conclusion
- Selected References (health & performance section)

Executive Summary

A recurring, low-frequency mechanical noise is intruding into 6176 Federal Blvd. from the tank-and-pump operation on the adjacent parcel at 6144 Federal Blvd. Seven recordings were analyzed: a daytime rooftop video (May 27, 2026), four early-morning interior recordings (June 10, 17, 23, and 27, 2026), a new deep-night exterior video (July 2, 2026, ~2:50 a.m.), plus a same-day source-off baseline (June 23). Across all six pump-on clips the audio consistently captures a continuous, strongly tonal, low-frequency sound whose harmonic structure is the characteristic signature of a motor-driven pump rather than traffic, wind, HVAC, or general urban background — and the May 27 video visually ties that sound to the green frac/holding tank, transfer pump, and vacuum truck next door. The same-day source-off baseline (same phone, same room, ~20 minutes after the June 23 clip, with the operation quiet) lacks that fingerprint entirely: the room is about 10 dB quieter (-29.2 vs -19.4 LUFs), the steady tonal line disappears, and the heavy low-frequency dominance collapses — exactly the on/off contrast a complaint needs. This is the acoustic character that codes and courts treat most seriously; two of the early-morning clips place it near 6:00 a.m., and the newest (A.5) places it at ~2:50 a.m., the most sensitive deep-night hour. The central limitation, stated plainly: every recording is uncalibrated, so none yields an absolute dB or dB(A) value or proves a numeric ordinance exceedance. These files are strong qualitative corroboration of the source's character, continuity, and recurrence; on their own they do not establish an absolute sound level at the 6176 boundary.

At-a-Glance Summary

Question	What the evidence supports	What it does not establish
Is there an intruding noise?	Yes — continuous, tonal, low-frequency machinery noise on six dates	—
What is the source?	A motor-driven pump; visually tied to the 6144 tank / pump / truck operation	Forensic chain-of-custody authentication (not yet performed)
How loud is it at 6176?	Cannot be stated in absolute terms — recordings are uncalibrated	Any specific dB / dB(A) value; any numeric ordinance exceedance
Does the source cause it?	Same-day source-off baseline is ~10 dB quieter with no steady tone	The absolute level of that difference at the property line
Is it legally actionable?	Plausible nuisance theory; favorable code factors (steady, tonal, LF, recurrent, early-morning / overnight)	Proof of a violation, which needs a calibrated survey
Economic / conduct claims	Alleged in the Davies statement (escrow loss; voicemail)	Independent verification; legal conclusions are for counsel

1. Purpose, Scope & Central Evidentiary Caveat

This report gives the owner of 6176 Federal Blvd. and any retained counsel a single, accurate synthesis of the acoustic evidence collected to date, the regulatory and legal framework that would govern a noise complaint or nuisance claim in San Diego, the health and task-efficiency literature relevant to this kind of noise, and a realistic assessment of what the current evidence can and cannot prove.

One caveat governs everything that follows. All seven recordings are uncalibrated. They were made on consumer devices with automatic gain control and unknown microphone sensitivity, and the audio is lossy in most cases; there is no acoustic reference tone in any clip. Consequence: the recordings can describe the kind of noise (frequency content, tonality, steadiness, timing) but cannot be converted to an absolute sound-pressure level (dB SPL or dB(A)). Because a San Diego noise violation is defined by an absolute A-weighted level at the property line, these files alone cannot prove an exceedance.

2. The Recordings and What Each One Shows

Each recording is summarized with the findings that are robust despite the calibration problem, because they concern the shape and timing of the sound rather than its absolute level.

2.1 Clip A.0 — May 27, 2026 (daytime rooftop video)

A 24-second 1080p phone video, geotagged to the Federal Blvd. corridor, shot from a rooftop over a perimeter wall into the adjacent yard. It visually identifies the operation: a large green holding/frac tank with a stair platform, a transfer pump on a green pipe manifold at its base, a stainless vacuum/pump truck, and rows of portable toilets — consistent with a Reliable Onsite Services / United Rentals depot. The sound is continuous and steady (short-term level varies only about ± 2 dB), low-frequency dominant ($\approx 46\%$ of the un-weighted energy below 200 Hz; strongest octave bands 80–315 Hz), and strongly tonal, with a clean harmonic stack on a ~ 100 Hz fundamental (overtones at 200/300/400/500/600/700 Hz) plus components near 64 Hz and 250–300 Hz. Significance: good qualitative corroboration that the source is a continuous, tonal pump, visually tied to the 6144 equipment; it cannot establish a decibel level.

2.2 Clip A.1 — June 10, 2026 (~6:00 a.m. interior)

A 38.5-second 1080p video with stereo audio, recorded while walking through the building interior (peak -2.1 dBFS; no clipping). Two things are mixed and must be separated: the loud broadband bursts are footsteps and handling — recording artifacts, not the pump — while the component attributable to the pump is the quieter steady tonal hum present throughout (this clip read a fundamental near 37 Hz with overtones at 75/112/150 Hz plus tones near 200 and 300 Hz). Honest weaknesses: only $\sim 4\%$ of the A-weighted energy sits below 250 Hz here, so the deep tones are de-emphasized for hearing, and the loudest moments are handling artifacts. A.1 shows a continuous tonal machinery noise is present inside 6176 at $\sim 6:00$ a.m.; it cannot show how loud it is at the property line.

2.3 Clip A.2 — June 17, 2026 (6:00 a.m. interior WAV)

A 15-second stereo WAV (44.1 kHz / 16-bit) — the cleanest recording (no clipping, negligible DC offset, crest factor ~ 13 dB) and the strongest for characterizing the source. The dominant source is unmistakably rotating machinery: a fundamental at ~ 99.6 Hz with a full harmonic series ($\sim 199/299/398/498/597/700$ Hz) plus a separate low component near 38 Hz. Energy is heavily low-frequency ($\approx 85\%$ below 200 Hz; the 125 Hz octave band alone $\sim 44\%$; spectral centroid ~ 165 Hz), and the noise is steady and continuous (the "fast" level varies only ~ 4 dB between L10 and L90) with a mild ~ 10 – 11 Hz amplitude modulation — a slight throb typical of pumps. Like the others it cannot supply a dB SPL value, because a WAV preserves only levels relative to digital full scale.

2.4 Clip A.3 — June 23, 2026 (~5:50 a.m. interior)

A 33.7-second 1080p clip (AAC 48 kHz stereo). The audio is dominated by a steady low-frequency tonal hum on a 73.2 Hz fundamental with a clean harmonic series (146.5 / 219.7 / 298.8 Hz), appearing in the spectrogram as a solid, unbroken bright line across the full clip. Energy below 250 Hz measured ~ 25 dB above the 1–8 kHz range; the relative level held within ~ 2 dB (integrated loudness -19.4 LUFS, relative). Incidental handling/footstep sounds

occur in the first several seconds, but the pump tone persists throughout. This clip is the on-source half of the matched pair with the baseline below.

2.5 Clip A.4 — June 27, 2026 (~4:00 a.m. interior, pre-dawn)

A 66.2-second recording (48 kHz, analyzed as mono) captured at the receiving location at approximately 4:00 a.m. — the first clip taken deep in the protected 10 p.m.–7 a.m. window, at the hour of lowest neighborhood ambient. The analysis shows a steady, continuous, tonal low-frequency drone consistent with continuously running rotating/reciprocating machinery: a 100 Hz fundamental with a full harmonic series (200/300/400/500/600/700 Hz) plus a component near 37 Hz, with the level varying only about ± 1.9 dB across the full minute. Energy is concentrated in the low and low-mid bands (loudest near the 90 Hz and 355 Hz octave bands). Significance: A.4 is the third clip to read a ~100 Hz fundamental (with A.0 and the clean A.2 WAV), which strengthens that figure as the machine's fundamental, while the ~37 Hz component echoes A.1 — consistent with a single motor-driven pump observed through different recording paths; and it extends the documented recurrence to a fourth separate early-morning/pre-dawn date. Like every other clip it is uncalibrated and cannot establish a dB SPL value.

2.6 Clip A.5 — July 2, 2026 (~2:50 a.m. exterior video) [NEW]

A 31.3-second 1080p phone video (AAC 48 kHz stereo) recorded outdoors at roughly 2:50 a.m. — the deepest-night clip in the set, well inside the protected 10 p.m.–7 a.m. window and at the hour of lowest neighborhood ambient. The audio again captures rotating/reciprocating machinery: a clean harmonic stack on a ~99.6 Hz fundamental with a full series (~199/299/398/498/598/697/797 Hz), the same ~100 Hz signature read in A.0, A.2 and A.4. The sound is continuous and steady (the three thirds of the clip fall within ~0.6 dB of one another; short-term L10–L90 spread ~5.3 dB), with a regular ~14 Hz throb typical of a pump. Its spectral balance is broader and more mid-weighted than the interior clips (spectral centroid ~535 Hz; ~11% of energy below 200 Hz, ~77% below 500 Hz; strongest octave band at 250 Hz) — the expected fingerprint of a running vacuum truck captured outdoors at close range, where the tonal pump partials sit atop the truck's own engine/mechanical noise rather than being filtered to a low hum through a wall. Technical quality is good (peak -3.9 dBFS, RMS -22.1 dBFS, crest ~18 dB, no clipping; L/R correlation 0.84). The video track shows a night scene in the United Rentals yard — a vehicle running with lights on, a green United Rental-branded container, and yard security lighting — corroborating active operation at that hour, though darkness and lens glare prevent the still frames from resolving the hose-to-tank connection. Significance: A.5 is the fourth clip to read a ~100 Hz fundamental, reinforcing that figure as the machine's fundamental, and it extends the documented recurrence to a sixth date and to the deepest part of the night (~2:50 a.m.). Like every other clip it is uncalibrated and cannot establish a dB SPL value. *Scope note: this clip evidences nighttime pumping and its noise character; it does not, and cannot, establish the tank's contents or the destination of any material.* See the linked A.5 Acoustical Analysis (Dropbox) in Source Links above.

2.7 Baseline File A — June 23, 2026 (source-off reference)

A 32.0-second clip recorded on the same phone, in the same room, about 20 minutes after A.3, with the operation quiet — the source-off reference the earlier exhibits identified as missing. It is markedly quieter (integrated loudness -29.2 LUFS) and variable rather than steady (0.2 s level std ~9.7 dB, ~37 dB swing). Critically, at 73 Hz there is no persistent tonal line (that frequency swings ~48 dB and tracks ordinary ambient), and the low-frequency dominance is gone (only ~6 dB low-vs-mid; ~20% of energy below 200 Hz). In short, the defining "machinery running continuously" signature present in A.0–A.5 is absent when the pump is off.

2.8 Reconciling the recordings

The analyses agree on the essentials — continuous, tonal, low-frequency, machinery-type — but the measured fundamental varies: ~100 Hz in the daytime A.0, the clean A.2 WAV, the pre-dawn A.4, and now the exterior A.5; ~37 Hz in the handling-contaminated A.1; and 73 Hz in A.3. The ~100 Hz reading is now the most reliable, appearing in four clips including the highest-quality WAV; the variation across dates is consistent with different

units, RPM, or transmission paths, and the precise fundamental cannot be fixed from these uncalibrated clips. In every clip the harmonic-series structure is consistent with a motor-driven pump.

3. Side-by-Side Comparison and the Baseline Contrast

Clip	Date / time	Setting	Steady & continuous?	Total fundamental	Low-freq dominance	Loudness (relative)
A.0	05-27, ~15:34	Rooftop over wall (outdoor)	Yes (± 2 dB; std ~ 1.7)	~ 100 Hz + harmonics (+64, 250–300)	$\sim 46\%$ energy < 200 Hz	mean ~ -19.9 dBFS
A.1	06-10, ~06:00	Interior, walking	Yes (tone steady ~ 2.5 dB)	~ 37 Hz + harmonics ($\sim 2,200$ rpm)	tonal LF present; mid-freq audible	Leq -25.3 dBFS
A.2	06-17, 06:00	Interior (WAV)	Yes (L10-L90 ~ 4 dB; std < 2)	~ 99.6 Hz + harmonics to 700 Hz	$\sim 85\%$ energy < 200 Hz; 125 Hz oct $\sim 44\%$	relative only
A.3	06-23, 05:50	Interior	Yes (std ~ 2.2 dB; unbroken line)	73.2 Hz + harmonics (146/220/299)	LF ~ 25 dB above 1–8 kHz	-19.4 LUFS
A.4	06-27, ~04:00	Interior, pre-dawn	Yes (± 1.9 dB std / 66 s)	100 Hz + harmonics; ~ 37 Hz	low/low-mid bands (90 & 355 Hz)	relative only
A.5	07-02, ~02:50	Exterior night video	Yes (thirds within 0.6 dB; L10-L90 ~ 5.3 dB)	~ 99.6 Hz + harmonics to ~ 800 Hz; ~ 14 Hz throb	mid-weighted (centroid ~ 535 Hz; strongest oct 250 Hz; $\sim 11\%$ < 200 Hz)	RMS -22.1 dBFS (peak -3.9)
Baseline A	06-23, 06:10	Interior (same as A.3)	No (std ~ 9.7 dB; ~ 37 dB swing)	No steady tone (73 Hz line swings ~ 48 dB)	LF only ~ 6 dB above mid; $\sim 20\%$ < 200 Hz	-29.2 LUFS

Pump-on clips (A.0–A.5) all share the steady / tonal / low-frequency profile; the source-off baseline does not. Only A.3 and the baseline use the same metric (EBU R128 integrated loudness) on the same device, making that pair the most directly comparable. A.5's higher spectral centroid reflects its outdoor, close-range setting (engine plus pump), not a different source — the ~ 100 Hz tonal stack is the same.

The contrast establishes three things, in relative terms. (1) The room is ~ 10 dB quieter with the pump off (-19.4 vs -29.2 LUFS, same device 20 minutes apart). (2) The steady tonal line disappears — A.3's unbroken 73 Hz band is absent in the baseline. (3) The low-frequency dominance collapses (from ~ 25 dB to ~ 6 dB low-vs-mid). This strongly corroborates that the intruding tonal, low-frequency energy comes from the 6144 operation rather than 6176's own ambient — though, because both files are uncalibrated, the ~ 10 dB figure is corroboration, not an absolute property-line number.

4. What the Acoustic Evidence Establishes — and What It Cannot

Reliably established (robust to calibration)	Basis
A continuous, steady mechanical noise is present	Level barely fluctuates within each clip (A.0 ± 2 dB; A.2 ~ 4 dB L10–L90; A.3 std ~ 2 dB; A.5 thirds within 0.6 dB)
The noise is strongly tonal and low-frequency	Harmonic series on a low fundamental; most energy below 200 Hz in the interior clips (A.0, A.2, A.3)
It is the signature of a motor-driven pump	Regular harmonic stack (and a pump-type ~ 10 – 14 Hz throb), categorically unlike traffic, wind, or HVAC
The source is the 6144 equipment	May 27 rooftop video shows the tank, pump, and truck; the A.5 night video shows active yard operation
It is present across the day and recurs	Three interior recordings at $\sim 6:00$ a.m.; daytime on a fourth; pre-dawn ($\sim 4:00$) on a fifth; deep-night ($\sim 2:50$ a.m.) on a sixth — six separate dates
The source (not ambient) drives it	Same-day source-off baseline is ~ 10 dB quieter with the tonal line gone

Not established by these recordings: any absolute sound level (no dB SPL or dB(A) from uncalibrated audio; relative dBFS describes the recorder's own range, not real-world loudness); any numeric ordinance exceedance (the San Diego limit is an absolute property-line level); how disruptive the noise is to occupants in level terms; and

the condition at the property line over time (each clip is a short sample without documented microphone position or distance).

A note on A-weighting. Much of this source's energy lies below ~125 Hz, where A-weighting (the dB(A) scale most ordinances use) discounts the level substantially — by roughly 12 dB for the A.2 recording. This cuts both ways and should be stated honestly: a dB(A)-only measurement can understate what an occupant perceives from a deep, throbbing source, yet a naive reading of the audio's loudness overstates the pump's contribution because the deep tones are physically strong but auditorily de-emphasized.

5. Open Factual Questions to Resolve Early

Use and zoning of 6176 (drives the numeric limit). The record is not consistent about what 6176 is: it has been described as a commercial space, while the A.1 interior assessment notes what appears to be a commercial office space setting. This matters a great deal — San Diego's property-line limits are far stricter for residential uses (e.g., on the order of 50 dB(A) daytime and 40 dB(A) overnight for single-family residential) than for commercial (on the order of 65 dB(A) daytime). The actual zoning of the parcel — not the building's appearance — controls; the zoning of both 6176 and 6144 is not established in the current record, and it governs the applicable limit.

Whether the timing triggers a specific restriction. It is tempting to read the early-morning and overnight timing as a direct violation of the 7:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m. prohibition in Municipal Code §59.5.0404, but that section governs construction, demolition, excavation, alteration, and repair — not necessarily an ongoing pumping operation. Whether a frac-tank transfer-pump operation falls within §59.5.0404 is a question for counsel; if it does not, the operative framework is the general property-line limits of §59.5.0401 plus the nuisance provision of §59.5.0501. Either way, the early-morning and now deep-night (~2:50 a.m.) timing remains highly relevant as a nuisance factor.

Equipment placement and source authentication. The statement describes the tank as roughly four to five feet from the exterior wall; that distance is not documented in the current record. Whether any placement was "deliberate" in a culpable sense is an inference, not a measured fact, and is better left to counsel. The original recordings have not been independently authenticated (device, settings, metadata, hash).

6. Applicable San Diego Noise Framework

San Diego regulates noise principally through Municipal Code Chapter 5, Article 9.5 (Noise Abatement and Control). Two features are central here.

The numeric limit — §59.5.0401. It is unlawful to cause noise whose one-hour-average sound level exceeds the applicable limit at any point on or beyond the boundary of the property producing it, counting only the portion of the total noise due to that source. Where a boundary lies between two zoning districts, the limit is the arithmetic mean of the two districts' limits. The table of limits (confirm current text and the applicable zoning before relying on it):

Land-use zone	Time of day	1-hr avg (dBA)
Single-family residential	7a–7p / 7p–10p / 10p–7a	50 / 45 / 40
Multi-family residential	7a–7p / 7p–10p / 10p–7a	55 / 50 / 45
All other residential	7a–7p / 7p–10p / 10p–7a	60 / 55 / 50
Commercial	7a–7p / 7p–7a	65 / 60
Manufacturing / industrial	any time	75

Source: San Diego Municipal Code §59.5.0401, Table of Applicable Limits.

A practical point: if the source-off ambient at 6176 already exceeds the table limit, the allowable level becomes the one-hour ambient plus 3 dB — so a quiet baseline at 6176 makes the standard correspondingly harder for the

operation to meet. A pump-off ambient measurement is therefore part of any proper survey (and the baseline analyzed here is qualitative support for that quiet floor).

The nuisance provision — §59.5.0501. Even noise within the numeric limit can be unlawful as a nuisance. The code's factors include the level of the noise, whether its nature is usual or unusual, the ambient level, the time of day, the duration, and whether the noise is recurrent, intermittent, or constant. A steady, tonal, low-frequency pump running into the early morning and deep night scores poorly on nearly every one — which is why the qualitative evidence here is meaningful even before any number is obtained.

Tonal and low-frequency considerations. Many noise codes attach a tonal penalty (commonly +5 dB) and separate low-frequency or nighttime provisions precisely because tonal, low-frequency sources are more intrusive than their broadband level suggests; a source can satisfy a broadband daytime limit yet still run afoul of a tonal or low-frequency provision. Whether San Diego's code applies such penalties to this source should be confirmed by counsel; the recordings already document the tonal, low-frequency character that would invoke them.

7. California Nuisance & Negligence Framework (General Information)

This section is general legal information, not legal advice; the statutes and cases below should be independently confirmed by counsel before they are relied upon. It is included so the owner understands the shape of the available theories.

Private nuisance — Civil Code §3479. A nuisance includes anything injurious to health, offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property that interferes with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property; persistent intrusive noise can fall within this definition. To prevail, a plaintiff must generally show the defendant created a condition, that it interfered with the plaintiff's use and enjoyment of the property, that the interference was both substantial and unreasonable, and that it was a legal cause of the harm. The substantial-and-unreasonable requirement is the heart of the case, weighing the gravity of the harm against the social utility of the conduct.

Noise is a nuisance, not a trespass — Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal.3d 229. The California Supreme Court held that noise alone, without physical damage to the property, will not support a trespass action; intangible intrusions such as noise, odor, and light are dealt with as nuisance. Wilson — and the older Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal.2d 265 — are commonly cited for the proposition that annoyance and discomfort from such intrusions can be compensable on a nuisance theory.

Public nuisance — Civil Code §3480. A public nuisance affects an entire community or neighborhood or a considerable number of persons at once. A private party generally may sue on a public-nuisance theory only where they have suffered a special injury different in kind from the general public; whether enough people are affected is fact-dependent and would need development.

Negligence and the role of notice. Independent of nuisance, a failure to abate a known harmful condition — particularly where straightforward mitigation exists (relocating equipment, acoustic enclosures, vibration isolation, or quieter equipment) — can support a negligence theory. Written notice matters because it establishes the operator's actual knowledge; conduct that continues after notice is materially different from conduct before it. California's punitive-damages statute (Civil Code §3294) requires clear and convincing evidence of malice, oppression, or fraud — a demanding standard whose application here is a judgment for counsel and should not be assumed.

Mitigation alternatives, and tenant remedies. If quieter, sound-attenuated pump equipment was reasonably available and was not used next to an occupied neighbor, that can bear on the "unreasonableness" element and on negligence, because it shows the harm was not unavoidable (confirm any such availability from a current primary source rather than assuming it, and frame it as availability of alternatives, not proof of intent). Separately, if 6176 is

leased, California implies a covenant of quiet enjoyment in most tenancies, and persistent third-party noise the landlord fails to address may bear on that covenant; the lease should be reviewed for noise, nuisance, habitability, abatement, and termination provisions.

8. Known Adverse Medical and Task-Efficiency Effects

The scientific literature on environmental and occupational noise is relevant background, used carefully: it describes population-level associations and general mechanisms and does not establish that any specific occupant of 6176 has suffered a particular effect. At that level, it supports why a continuous, tonal, low-frequency, early-morning/overnight source is treated as more than a mere annoyance.

Medical and physiological. The WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (2018) associate chronic environmental noise with annoyance, sleep disturbance, and — at sustained higher exposures — cardiovascular and metabolic effects at the population level, with night-time and early-morning exposure treated as particularly sensitive [1]. Mechanistically, recurrent noise acts as a stressor (autonomic and endocrine arousal even without full awakening) that over time is linked to oxidative stress, vascular inflammation, and cardiovascular outcomes [2]; WHO ranks sleep disturbance and annoyance as the largest noise-attributable health losses [1][3].

Sleep and the overnight timing. Several of these clips fall near 6:00 a.m., one at ~4:00 a.m., and the newest at ~2:50 a.m. Nighttime noise degrades sleep efficiency even without full waking, and for low-frequency noise specifically, studies report difficulty falling asleep, more awakening, and morning fatigue, with a dose-response to the low-frequency content that persists after controlling for A-weighted level [4]; one controlled study found nighttime low-frequency noise altered the cortisol response to awakening and lowered sleep quality [5].

Why low-frequency, tonal character amplifies the effect. A-weighting discounts energy below ~125 Hz, so a sound that measures "acceptable" in dB(A) can still be loud and highly annoying when its energy is low-frequency [6]; and tonal noise is rated more annoying than broadband at equal level, which is why codes apply tonal penalties. Reviews link low-frequency noise to annoyance, concentration difficulty, reduced sleep, headache, irritability, fatigue, and stress, with annoyance the first and most reliable effect [4][7].

Task efficiency and business use. Continuous intruding noise degrades complex, attention-demanding work — reading, prose memory, mental arithmetic — while raising errors, fatigue, and stress [8]; a 2024 meta-analysis tied low-frequency noise to impaired attention, executive function, memory, and higher-order cognition [9]. The honest framing is that this is the kind of exposure the literature associates with such effects; because the recordings are uncalibrated they place the source within the character most associated with harm without locating it on a dose-response curve.

9. The Complainant's Factual Narrative (Davies Statement) — Allegations to Be Verified

Everything in this section is drawn from the Davies Statement of Events and reflects that account. It involves named individuals and describes conversations and conduct that have not been independently verified here. It is presented as allegations and recollections to be preserved and evaluated by counsel — not as established fact, and not as a legal conclusion about any person.

Discovery and the cancelled escrow. Per the statement, the broker (Jeff Davies), listing the property for its owner (Darryl Cotton), noticed a persistent odor in early 2026 that survived repeated cleaning; prospective buyers commented on the odor, and during a buyer's inspection the team reportedly observed from the roof that the source of both the odor and the noise was the adjacent frac tank and pumping activity. The statement reports escrow was cancelled with the buyer citing the neighboring operation, and the owner withdrew the property. If substantiated, a cancelled sale and any resulting diminution in value are the kind of concrete economic harm a nuisance claim can address; California's Transfer Disclosure Statute (Civil Code §1102 et seq.) requires sellers to

disclose known material facts, including neighborhood noise or nuisance problems. The escrow documents, communications, and any appraisal evidence would bear on this account.

Reported interactions. The statement describes a June 9, 2026 visit to 6144 in which the on-site manager (named in the statement as David Perez) declined to review the materials and said the operation would not change, and an earlier voicemail (June 6, 2026) from a person identified as the company's head of corporate security (named as Mike Marsalisi) warning the broker not to return on pain of criminal-trespass prosecution. If accurate, these may bear on whether the operator had actual notice; but the words attributed to these individuals are one party's recollection, the voicemail (if it exists) has not been independently verified, and whether any of this is independently actionable is a legal judgment for counsel — it should not be characterized here as intimidation, malice, or a crime.

10. Landlord (Westport Properties) Considerations

The Davies statement identifies Westport Properties, Inc. (Newport Beach) as the owner of 6144 and states its CEO was contacted by email and phone about the situation and a proposed resolution, without response. The following is general framework, not a conclusion about Westport's liability. As a general rule a landlord is not liable for a nuisance created solely by a tenant after possession transfers; California recognizes exceptions (consistent with the Restatement (Second) of Torts) where the landlord consented to the activity or knew or had reason to know at leasing or renewal that it would likely cause a nuisance, with a separate line of authority on a landlord's response after actual notice. Whether any exception applies turns on facts not yet in the record: what Westport knew and when, the terms of the United Rentals lease (including any anti-nuisance or compliance covenant), and whether Westport had and declined available means to require abatement. Practically, the June 10, 2026 Davies statement reflects that Westport was put on notice of the operation, and the A.4 (June 27, 2026) and A.5 (July 2, 2026) recordings document that the noise continued after that notice — the latter deep in the night at ~2:50 a.m.

11. Conclusion

The recordings credibly document a continuous, tonal, low-frequency pumping source emanating from the operation at 6144 Federal Blvd. and intruding into 6176 — near 6:00 a.m. on multiple dates, during daytime on another, in the pre-dawn (~4:00 a.m.) on a fifth, and now at ~2:50 a.m. on July 2 — and the matched same-day baseline confirms the signature is the source's, not the building's own ambient. This is the acoustic character that codes and courts treat most seriously, and it is also the type the health literature associates with sleep disruption, chronic-stress and cardiovascular risk, and reduced cognitive and task performance. What the recordings cannot do is prove how loud the noise is at the property line, and so they cannot, by themselves, prove a numeric ordinance violation; no absolute decibel value can responsibly be assigned to these uncalibrated clips.

This report is a technical and informational synthesis. This revision was prepared on July 2, 2026, adding Clip A.5 and superseding the June 23, 2026 version, from the supplied recordings and the Davies Statement of Events. Acoustic characterization by Claude (Anthropic). It is not a calibrated acoustical-engineering report, a clinical assessment of any person, or legal advice. The acoustic findings should be confirmed by a licensed acoustical consultant and the legal framework by a licensed California attorney before any action is taken in reliance on it. Levels are relative (uncalibrated) and must not be presented as absolute dB(A) SPL.

Selected References (health & performance section)

- [1] World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe. Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region. Copenhagen, 2018.
- [2] Munzel T. et al. "Noise causes cardiovascular disease: it's time to act." Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology, 2024.
- [3] WHO Europe / Environmental Noise Guidelines special-issue introduction (DALY burden: sleep disturbance, annoyance, ischaemic heart disease, cognitive impairment).

- [4] Baliatsas C. et al. "Health effects from low-frequency noise and infrasound in the general population." *Science of the Total Environment*, 2016.
- [5] Persson Waye K. et al. "Effects of nighttime low-frequency noise on the cortisol response to awakening and subjective sleep quality." *Life Sciences*, 2003.
- [6] Kjellberg A. et al. (1984); Nilsson (2007): A-weighting underestimates perceived loudness and annoyance of low-frequency-dominant sound at equal dB(A).
- [7] "Low-Frequency Noise and Its Main Effects on Human Health — A Review of the Literature (2016–2019)." *Applied Sciences (MDPI)*, 2020.
- [8] Clark C. & Sorqvist P. "A 3-year update on the influence of noise on performance and behavior." *Noise & Health*, 2012; with Stansfeld & Matheson (2003).
- [9] "Effect of low-frequency noise exposure on cognitive function: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *BMC Public Health*, 2024.