



## UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO  
PO BOX 95001  
SANTA ANA CA 92709-5001

M60050.001469  
MCAS EL TORO  
SSIC # 5090.3

MAR 22 1996

IN REPLY REFER TO:

6284

1AU

MAR 19 1996

Department of Toxic Substances Control  
Attn: Ms. Marcia Murphy, Chief  
Public Participation and Education  
400 P Street, 4th Floor  
P.O. Box 806  
Sacramento, CA 95812-0806

Dear Ms. Murphy:

Thank you for your letter dated February 21, 1996 expressing concern regarding the Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) participation in Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro's Community Relations Plan (CRP). The public participation specialist for DTSC provided comments on the draft, and the draft final CRP. The document referenced in your letter was actually the draft final which incorporated comments from the previous reviews from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and DTSC. Although DTSC's comments on the draft final were received 30 days late, consideration was given by MCAS El Toro and a Responsiveness Summary was prepared to demonstrate how each comment was addressed throughout the various reviews.

The DTSC Remedial Project Manager (RPM) serves as a member of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) and has provided valuable comments throughout the environmental cleanup process. Additionally, we recognize the contribution provided by your staff to support public participation for the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) and the expanded community. All comments received are given full consideration for incorporation into the document. A Responsiveness Summary is provided as enclosure (1) to address how all comments were handled.

Meetings were held at the beginning and mid-point of the process to update the CRP for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Tustin and El Toro where roles and responsibilities were established for the two Air Stations. I propose a meeting with the agencies responsible for providing support to the public participation effort at MCAS El Toro to revisit the process set up and ensure effective communication and coordination.

We are committed to continuing our excellent relationship with the community and providing updated information throughout the cleanup process. Additionally, we will continue to meet the requirements of the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) and all federal, state laws and regulations.

If you have any questions or comments please contact me at (714) 726-3470.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joseph Joyce". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

JOSEPH JOYCE  
Base Realignment and Closure  
Environmental Coordinator  
By direction of  
the Commanding General

Encl:

(1) Responsiveness Summary

Copy to: (w/1 copy of encl (1)

AC/S, Environment, MCAS El Toro, Mr. Wayne Lee

AC/S, BRAC, MCAS El Toro, Colonel Jim Ritchey

BRAC, MCAS El Toro, Major Frank Baynard

BRAC, MCAS El Toro, Captain Brad Bartelt

MCAS El Toro, Mr. Vish Parpiani

SOUTHWESTNAVFACENGCOM, Mr. Dana Sakamoto

SOUTHWESTNAVFACENGCOM, Mr. James Pawlisch

DTSC, Mr. John Scandura

DTSC, Ms. Claire Best

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO  
DRAFT REVISED COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN**

*Italicized print indicates new/revised text*

September 18, 1995

Comments by: **Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA**

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
	<p>Reviewing my notes from the interviews, there is a wide range of opinions regarding the Navy's credibility in completing the environmental clean up. While most indicate a high degree of credibility in the Navy/Marine Corps, others have little faith. Stated reasons for the low credibility were mostly related to skepticism in Congress allocating the required money. However, a little less than one quarter of the interviewees stated that their low confidence in the military stems from the military's historic lack of openness and a belief that they are currently not interested in cleaning up the environment.</p> <p>While the document mentions that a range of opinions exist, it tends to reiterate a theme regarding the community's sense of trust (see page ES-1, 1-6, 2-3 (Section 2.2.1.3 omitted info regarding community members having low credibility in Navy/Marine Corps), and 2-5). To counterbalance this theme with those interviewees who expressed a different view, I suggest that more information about the lack of confidence be added.</p> <p>The above is especially true for the City of Irvine since this city is the home for interview representatives from the Alliance for Survival. This group was one of the most outspoken in stating their low rating regarding the military's credibility which leads them to be dependent upon the "state of actively monitor the project and protect the public's health and environment".</p>	<p>The first sentence of Section 2.2.1.5 will be revised, <i>deleting</i> the phrase: <i>With some exceptions,</i> A new sentence addressing the low credibility mentioned in this comment will be added after the first sentence.</p> <p>Executive summary paragraph 5, new sentence will be inserted between second and third sentence to read: <i>Skepticism toward sufficient Congressional funding for adequate cleanup was expressed by some while others stated that military credibility deserves a low rating.</i></p> <p>A discussion on the level of confidence and credibility is presented in Section 2.2.1.5. It is believed that an independent section on this issue serves to focus the reader on the intensity of the issue, rather than incorporating credibility and confidence responses into the other summaries of concerns (e.g., environmental, reuse).</p> <p>The Alliance for Survival issue will be addressed in the second paragraph of Section 2.2.1.1 to illustrate a specific example of credibility, confidence, and environmental issues.</p>

	Also include in the document that one interviewee stated his open distrust of state government and the negative impact they cause for businesses.	This will be included as the last sentence in second paragraph of Section 2.2.1.5.
<b>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b>		
1	<p><b>1.3 Description of Local Communities.</b> Please provide data references for the statistics and conclusions stated in these paragraphs. Without the references, the conclusions and statistics can be read as less than factual information. My concern is that if community members disagree with the conclusions, it may weaken the impact of the factual material presented from the interviews. Examples include:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Lake Forest ranks third in population among the southern Orange County communities</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Lake Forest households reflect a newer community with a predominance of young families (79 percent) . . .</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">. . . many retired MCAS El Toro personnel have remained in the area</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Laguna Hills, while not maintaining a regular relationship with MCAS El Toro is interested in military activities that influence the economics and environmental quality of the city demographics</p>	Text has been added into Section 1.3 to provide a reference source for the statistics and conclusions in the descriptions of local communities. Information in this section was provided by the Cities of Lake Forest, Irvine, and Laguna Hills.
2	<p><b>2.0 Community Involvement and Issues.</b> Please clarify statement, "The communities neighboring MCAS El Toro have played a relatively small role in activities related to the base's environmental issues." This statement may seem very confusing to those community members who have spent large amounts of professional and personal time reviewing and commenting on draft documentation.</p>	This statement will be deleted from Section 2.0.
3	<p><b>2.2 Community Interview Results.</b> Verify the number of interviewees. Was it only 28 for El Toro and 31 for Tustin?</p>	According to CLEAN II project files, 28 interviews were conducted for MCAS El Toro and 36 for MCAS Tustin. The MCAS Tustin CRP will reflect this change.

<p>4</p>	<p><b>2.1.1 Environmental.</b> The concerns listed in the first sentence of the first paragraph was shared by all categories of interviewees, not just the environmental groups and elected official. Please edit accordingly.</p> <p>My notes do not reflect the statement, "the groundwater and trichloroethylene issues have been blown out of proportion because there has been no impact on drinking water wells." therefore, I assume that this was stated in one of the interviews that I could not attend. Since it does not reflect a reoccurring sediment, I suggest that we quantify it with an introductory phrase.</p> <p>A suggestion is made to utilize the written summaries to state the major themes and distinctions made within the interviewees. Following this idea, elaborate more on a major theme present in the interviews, namely fear that the project will produce unnecessary years of studies, and a related fear of military compromise on clean up efforts due to high costs (see last bullet).</p> <p>Clarify 1st sentence, in first full paragraph, page 2-4, "A small number of those interviewed were fully satisfied with the <i>public' access</i> to information about environmental activities . . ." (italics are mine). Is this limited to the info repository which is referred to in the next sentence?</p>	<p>The first sentence of Section 2.2.1.1 will be revised to read: <i>According to all categories of interviewees, environmental concerns...</i></p> <p>The third sentence will be revised to read: <i>One individual interviewed expressed that soil contamination is of concern. It was also this person's opinion that the groundwater...</i></p> <p>Elaboration of concerns will be addressed in revisions to Section 2.2, per discussion with M. Mingay (11/21/95). See response to General Comments.</p> <p>The TCE statement (middle of first paragraph, Section 2.2.1.1) will be removed as it diminishes the greater importance of the subsequent bullet-point concerns. These concerns will be reordered to bring two major concerns to the top of the list.</p> <p>The first sentence of this paragraph will be deleted.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p><b>2.2.1.1 Environmental.</b> Verify that the following concerns were only expressed during Tustin interviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>historical environmental practices that caused this contamination</li> <li>proper handling and disposal of wastes currently generated on base</li> </ul>	<p>First quote - confirmed inclusion in Tustin CRP; unable to find this quote in this section of El Toro CRP.</p> <p>Reviewed summaries and found this concern arose in several interviews, some of which were for both bases.</p>

6	<p><b>2.2.1.4 Restoration Advisory Board.</b> According to my notes, 17 interviewees stated that they were unaware of the RAB. Please review and assess your data supporting this conclusion. I believe a closer summation would be, "The majority of those interviewed, who were not associated to the Restoration Advisory Board, were unaware of the RAB and its purpose. However, after interviewees were informed of the RAB, most indicated an interest in receiving more information."</p>	<p>Suggested changes will be incorporated. First two sentences of Section 2.2.1.4 Restoration Advisory Board will read: <i>Approximately half of those interviewed, who were not associated with the MCAS El Toro RAB, were unaware of the RAB and its purpose. Of these, most indicated a desire to receive additional information on the RAB. Of the respondents who were aware of the RAB, half consider the board effective in its contributions to the base's environmental programs.</i></p>
7	<p><b>Table 3-1.</b> Add check mark to establish information repository for non-time critical removals.</p>	<p>Suggested change will be incorporated.</p>
8	<p><b>3.2.1.2 Fact Sheets.</b> Page 3-6, last sentence in this section, add "general public" to list of entities receiving the fact sheets.</p>	<p>Suggested change will be incorporated to read: ... homeowners' associations, members of the RAB, and members of the general public.</p>
9	<p><b>3.2.2.2 Public Meetings.</b> Correct information to reflect that public meetings at the conclusion of a site investigation, the conclusion of a remedial response actions, or for removal actions are not required by law or regulation. They are, however, very much appreciated.</p>	<p>The first three sentences of Section 3.2.2.2 will be revised to read: <i>As required by federal and state environmental regulations, a public meeting will be held to present preferred cleanup alternatives for remedial response actions. Public meetings at the conclusion of a site investigation, the conclusion of a remedial response action, or for removal actions are not required by law or regulation. However, if such meetings are held, they may present, for example, a summary of...</i></p>
10	<p><b>3.2.3.1 Mailing List.</b> Please list all categories which must be included in a mailing, or provide the complete listing of categories in the appendix.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.3.1 mailing list categories will be expanded to include the same list provided in last paragraph of Section 3.2.1.1 (Fact Sheets).</p>
11	<p><b>3.2.3.2 Evaluation of Community Relations Activities.</b> Please clarify who will review, on a quarterly basis, the public information and activities described in this plan. And, elaborate on how they will be evaluated.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.3.2 will be revised to read: The public information...<i>will be reviewed quarterly by the Marine Corps/Navy and their community relations contractors for effectiveness in meeting community relations program goals and objectives. The lead regulatory agency, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, also may evaluate activities for their effectiveness. Recommendations for improved community relations activities and enhanced public participation will be communicated in writing to</i></p>

		<i>the Marine Corps/Navy. Such recommendations also will be welcomed from members of the MCAS El Toro community.</i>
12	<b>3.2.3.3 Community Relations Program Revisions.</b> The last sentence on page 3-11 assumes that the RI/FS will be complete at the time of the next CRP revision. Please provide the basis for this, or revise the sentence to include this phase of the project.	The first sentence of Section 3.2.3.3, text will be revised to read: <i>Revisions to all or parts of the Plan may be made in order to incorporate new information, reflect changes in community concern, and adjust public participation activities to meet these changes. A revised Plan ensures that the Marine Corps/Navy remains sensitive to community concerns through all phases of the project. Regular revisions to the Plan will be scheduled for no later than two years from the issue of the current Plan or at the start of basewide remedial actions, if this occurs sooner than two years.</i> The second and third sentences in the current version will remain.

13	<p><b>4.1 Facility Overview.</b> First paragraph states, "Recent recognition that the wastes produced . . . resulted in new laws and regulations." Please include a time frame to eliminate ambiguity of "recent" and "new".</p>	<p>Sentence will be revised to read: <i>Since the 1970's, it has been recognized that the wastes produced... and the environment. This awareness has resulted in laws and regulations governing their disposal</i></p>
14	<p><b>Appendix C Community Interviews History, 2a.</b> Since the following bullet does not answer the question, where did you get your information, are we sure that it is in the correct place?                  "public is learning that the planning for and distribution of . "</p>	<p>This statement will be reworded to read: <i>through the reuse process (land use planning and distribution) the community is also learning about the base's environmental activities and how these issues are related; this reuse information most often comes from the media</i></p>
15	<p>Last bullet, please check accuracy of quote, "I have a minimum expectation for a healthy environment - something is wrong if we can't expect this".</p>	<p>Accuracy of quote confirmed from two sets of interview notes (A. Schwartz and O. Cervantes-Kress, BNI contractors)</p>
16	<p><b>Community Involvement, 4, c (page C-5).</b> Change "several interviewees" to "most interviewees did not know about the RAB".</p>	<p>Suggested change will be incorporated.</p>
17	<p><b>Communication</b>  <b>7 Radio Stations.</b> Add KLOS, KFWB and KOCE.</p>	<p>Suggested change will be incorporated</p>
18	<p><b>Communication</b>  <b>8 TV Stations.</b> Add CNN, Channel 4 and Channel 7 to this section and, when applicable, Appendix D.</p>	<p>Suggested changes for Appendix C will be incorporated. Channels 7 and 4 are currently listed in Appendix D (page D-4). CNN is not considered a local media resources and, therefore, is not included in Appendix D, per discussion with BRAC Public Affairs Officer.</p>
19	<p><b>10 Other information you'd like to receive.</b> Move the following to number 14, "other comments".                  keep the closest people satisfied                  information package that reach homes through the school                  use proactive risk communication</p>	<p>Suggested changes will be incorporated.</p>

<p>20</p>	<p><b>Page C-14 Community-at-Large.</b> EPA's Superfund guide, page 27 states, "the names . . . . of private citizens contacted for interviews should not be included as part of the plan that is made public." Please delete them from the listing. A suggestion is made to include the category name and follow it with a sentence which reads, "The list of private citizens interviewed is maintained separately to protect their privacy."</p>	<p><b>Suggested change will be incorporated with minor revision. Text under Community-at-Large heading (Page C-14) will be added to read: <i>The list of private community members interviewed is maintained separately to protect their privacy.</i></b></p>
<p>21</p>	<p><b>Appendix D Contracts for Targeted Involvement and Outreach.</b> Please verify that we have included all interested and affected school districts.</p>	<p><b>Contacts for the affected schools in the neighboring districts have been added to the mailing list. A contact for the Orange County Department of Education will be added to Appendix D for special outreach. Mr. Tom Tuller, Safety Officer for Saddleback Unified School District, is currently included in Appendix D.</b></p>
<p><b>MISCELLANEOUS COMMENT</b></p>		
<p>1</p>	<p>Please ensure that the following organizations and news media outlets are included in the plan since they were listed by the interviewees. (Note, I have not verified the existence of these groups, nor their appropriate names. What appears below is the reprinted names from interview notes.):</p>	
	<p>Interest Groups and avenues for releasing information into a broad community network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern citizens</li> <li>Laguna Canyon Conservancy</li> <li>Stop Polluting our Newport</li>   <li>Laguna City of Conservancy</li> <li>Friends of Bolsa Chica</li>   <li>United Methodist Church, Saddleback</li> <li>Shepard of the Hills, Mission Viejo</li>   <li>Saddleback College, attention: Lee Wain</li>   <p>Media Outlets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Union Hispanic</li> </ul> </ul>	<p><b>Unable to identify an organization of this (or similar) title Researching - will add to mailing list when determined Tom Edwards, who mentioned this group as an organizations in which he is involved, is on the mailing list. Assuming same as Laguna Canyon Conservancy Friends of Bolsa Chica is now Amigos de Bolsa Chica - added to Appendix D These two churches are one organization and will be added to Appendix D</b></p> <p><b>Lee Wain is an instructor so will be added to the project mailing list. Tom Tuller is already included as the Safety Officer and therefore will be listed as the primary contact.</b></p>

	<b>Seminolas Mineonas</b>	<b>Unable to find contact points or detailed information on these media outlets. Appendix D lists <u>Azteca</u> as an Orange County Hispanic publication</b>
--	-------------------------------	--

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

**February 20, 1996**

**Comments by: Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA**

<b>Number</b>	<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<p>b. <b>Guidance Used for this CRP</b> To enhance the public's credibility of the CRP, this section would clearly state that the CRP meets all of the applicable federal and state regulations and guidance for establishing a community relations plans (see Example 2).</p>	<p><b>B. See 1D response above</b></p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>All valid comments received [by the RAB] should be incorporated in the final document. Some of these will require a lengthy preparation time, and should be started early.</p>	<p>All comments received by the RAB have been considered and incorporated as appropriate. Maps and community descriptions have been enhanced.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Section 1</b></p> <p>a. Paragraph 2, sentence 2, this sentence needs to be modified to accurately describe the regulatory relationship of the Marine Corps/Navy, U.S. EPA and the state as described in the Federal Facility Agreement.</p> <p>b. Also, one additional contact needs to be added to the list in the middle of page 1-1.</p> <p><b>Ms. Marsha Mingay Public Participation Specialist Department of Toxic Substances Control</b></p>	<p><b>A This relationship is discussed in new text of Section 4.3 (see 1B response above).</b></p> <p><b>B. See 1A response above.</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Section 2.2.1.1</b></p> <p>Quantify the number of community members who stated that they do "not have sufficient information to know if other environmental</p>	<p><b>This sentence summarizes opinions of those interviewed. First</b></p>

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

February 20, 1996

Comments by: Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
1.	<p>The document adequately reflects the information shared during the community interviews. However, additional information should be included to provide the reader with a complete understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>resources available to them</i> (DTSC added as a point of contact in the introduction section (page 1-1); and our <u>Public Participation Policy and Procedure Manual</u> added to Section 5)</li> <li>b. <i>roles and responsibilities for each agency involved</i> (will require additional information for Section 4.3)</li> <li>c. <i>the legal document which defines our working relationship</i> (new section to be added)</li> <li>d. <i>the guidance used in establishing the CRP</i> (new section to be added)</li> </ul>	<p>A. Contacts currently listed will remain. Additional contacts are provided in Appendix B, as referenced in Introduction, 2nd paragraph.</p> <p>B. Following the first sentence of 3rd paragraph of Section 4.3, text now reads: <i>This core team is currently operating under a Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) to reach technical milestones. The schedule from the FFA is included as Appendix G. The FFA also outlines the working relationship between the Marine Corps/Navy and regulatory agencies and clearly lays out mutual obligation of the parties to the agreement in implementing Superfund activities at MCAS El Toro. U.S. EPA (Region 9) and the State of California are signatories to the FFA with the Marine Corps/Navy. As such, U.S. EPA and the State of California provide guidance and oversight for the Installation Restoration Program. Additional information about the roles and responsibilities of the core team are available in the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Plan (BCP).</i></p> <p>C. See 1B response above.</p> <p>D. Text in Introduction now states that the CRP is developed according to the requirements outlined in the NCP and U. S. EPA's <i>Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook</i>.</p>
2.	<p>To incorporate this information into the CRP, create new sections for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Federal Facilities Agreement</b> Since this document provides a fundamental working basis for all team members, a summary of its content will educate the reader of its existence and content (see Example 1).</li> </ul>	<p>A. Reference to FFA provided in Section 4.3 (see 1B response above)</p>

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

**February 20, 1996**

**Comments by: Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA**

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
	concerns may exist or if current waste management practices are more responsible than past practices." (see 2nd paragraph, page 2-2)	sentence of 2nd paragraph of Section 2.2.1.1 now reads: <i>It was expressed by interviewees that the community-at-large may not have sufficient...</i>
6.	<p>Section 2.2.1.3</p> <p>According to your introductory paragraph,"... among the interviewees there was a contrasting range in the level of interest ..." The second paragraph characterizes one view expressed, namely that of confidence in the Marine Corps/Navy. To provide the reader with a balanced view of the comments received, provide additional information describing the contrasting view which was expressed, namely low confidence. As an alternative suggestion, the second paragraph could be deleted since the discussion on the level of confidence and credibility is presented in Section 2.2.1.5.</p>	<p><b>This section summarizes communication and involvement issues. Interviewees cited the credibility issue to establish support for the opinion that the public does not need to be actively involved. The opening sentence and subsequent text continues to discuss involvement; credibility and confidence levels are discussed in detail in Section 2.2.1.5. Text in both sections will remain as presented.</b></p>
7.	<p>Section 2.2.1.4 - 1st paragraph:</p> <p>Clarify that one agency felt that the RAB "...is not considered an effective forum for local regulatory agencies to provide feedback to the Marine Corps/Navy, nor facilitate technical discussion at a regulatory level.</p>	<p><b>Statement not credited to any interviewee affiliation in order to preserve anonymity of respondent. Text to remain as presented.</b></p>
8.	<p>Section 2.2.1.5</p> <p>To increase clarity, substitute the pronoun "they" with the proper noun, "Marine Corps/Navy" (see 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence).</p>	<p><b>Text revised to incorporate comment.</b></p>

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

**February 20, 1996**

**Comments by: Marsha Mingos, MS, Long Beach, CA**

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
9.	<p>Section 3.1.2</p> <p>According to Information shared during the recent BCT meetings, the seven EE/CAs currently being reviewed do not fit within the three main characteristics listed in this first paragraph. Specifically, the EE/CAs were initiated <u>before</u> the site investigations were concluded. Please correct the paragraph accordingly.</p>	<p>Text in 2nd paragraph, Section 3.1.2, revised to read: <i>At MCAS El Toro, removal actions will focus on short-term and cost-effective cleanup methods and the combining of other removal actions to expedite the cleanup and increase cost-effectiveness.</i></p>
10.	<p>Table 3-1</p> <p>Correct the table to reflect, <u>EPA's Community Relations Handbook</u>, Exhibit 2-1, which reads that a 30-day comment period, a public meeting (with transcript) and a responsiveness summary must accompany the RI/FS and Proposed Plan.</p> <p>A CRP revision is required after the signing of the Record Decision (ROD) and before the implementation of remedial activities. To better reflect this requirement, move the check mark to the Completion of the ROD column.</p>	<p>Revisions to chart incorporated for public comment period and public meeting. The responsiveness summary is completed as part of the Record of Decision package; this check mark will remain as presented.</p> <p>CRP revision check mark will be moved as suggested.</p>
11.	<p>Table 3-2</p> <p>To clarify the requirements, expand the heading, "Provide 30-day comment period" to inform the reader what mechanism is used (e.g., Provide 30-day comment period and publish notice).</p>	<p>Headings in Table 3-2 combined to read: <i>Provide 30-day comment period; publish public notice and description of EE/CA.</i></p>

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

**February 20, 1996**

**Comments by: Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA**

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
12.	<p>3.2.2.1</p> <p>Expand the last sentence in the first paragraph to include information printed in boldface italics below, "To meet the President's requirement, MCAS El Toro initiated and continues to support the RAB <i>as described in the joint DoD and U.S. EPA Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidelines (DoD and U.S. EPA 1994).</i>"</p> <p>Change information in the paragraph (see page 3-8) to reflect the new RAB meeting starting time of 6:30 p.m.</p>	<p>Comment incorporated.</p> <p>The start of all RAB meetings at 6:30 pm may not be final. Text has been added to read: <i>For up-to-date RAB scheduling information, contact the individuals listed in Section 1, Introduction.</i></p>
13.	<p>Section 3.2.2.5</p> <p>Following the format for Section 2.3.1.2 on information repositories, include the location of the Administrative Record.</p>	<p>On-base and Southwest Division (San Diego) administrative record locations now referenced in this section.</p>
14.	<p>Section 3.2.3.2</p> <p>DTSC may evaluate the effectiveness of the community relations activities and therefore DTSC should be included in this section. Please add the following words (written in boldface italics below) into the existing sentence which reads, "The lead regulatory agency, the U.S. EPA, <i>as well as the State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control</i> may evaluate activities for their effectiveness."</p>	<p>Comment incorporated.</p>

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - EL TORO**

**February 20, 1996**

**Comments by: Marsha Mingay, DTSC, Long Beach, CA**

Number	GENERAL COMMENTS	Response
15.	<p>Section 4.3</p> <p>This section currently states the role of the U.S. Marine Corps; however the roles and responsibilities of the regulatory agencies are not included. This information is necessary to educate the reader on the roles and responsibilities for each of the team members (see Example 3, Agency Coordination and Oversight, 2nd paragraph; and Example 4, Implementation Responsibility).</p>	<p>See 1B response above.</p>
16.	<p>Section 5</p> <p>Include in this listing, the DTSC's <u>Public Participation Policy and Procedure Manual</u> (document number EO-94-002-PP, printed July 1994).</p>	<p>See 1D response above.</p>
17.	<p>Appendix B</p> <p>Reflect the change of DTSC's Project Manager from Juan Jimenez to Tayseer Mahmoud. Mr. Mahmoud's telephone number is (310) 590-4891.</p>	<p>Text revised.</p>