

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
FOR
A HAZARDOUS WASTE PART B FACILITY PERMIT
AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
CHEVRON EL SEGUNDO REFINERY
EPA ID NO. CAD 008 336 901**

INTRODUCTION

The Chevron El Segundo Refinery. (Chevron), located at 324 West El Segundo Boulevard in Los Angeles County, submitted an application for renewal of its RCRA-equivalent Hazardous Waste Facility Permit to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) on March 2, 2005. On December 14, 2006, DTSC issued a public notice on the proposed Permit and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Negative Declaration. The public comment period ended on February 13, 2007.

During the public comment period, DTSC received a set of 89 comments from 26 members of the public which has been included in its entirety.

DTSC conducted a public hearing on January 23, 2007 at the El Segundo Public Library at 111 West Mariposa Avenue, El Segundo California 90245.

The proposed Permit package, comprised of the Permit application and documentation pertaining to Chevron's Negative Declaration are located at the El Segundo Public Library, 111 West Mariposa Avenue, El Segundo, CA 90245 and at DTSC's office located at 1011 N. Grandview Avenue, Glendale, California 91201 (Glendale Office).

Members of the public who are interested in reviewing Chevron's administrative record, which includes documentation and correspondence associated with its permitting and enforcement history, may contact DTSC's representative, Ms. Jone Barrio at (818)551-2886 at the Glendale Office.

RESPONSES

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
PUBLIC LETTERS AND E-MAILS			
KLH-1	Kelly and Laurie Hamm	I would just love to see Chevron keep reducing the communities [sic] exposure to particulates and the by products of oil refining. Every time I drive through El Segundo and smell the coke particulates or some other emission related pollution, I am disappointed.	DTSC regulates only the management of hazardous wastes. DTSC has no control over refinery emission resulting from crude oil refining. The Chevron Refinery operates subject to air pollution control permit(s) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). SCAQMD has required measurement of chemicals in the emissions. The SCAQMD is responsible for responding to complaints of any emissions, including reported obnoxious odors, from the facility. The SCAQMD Hotline telephone number is 1(800)-CUT-SMOG (1-800-288-7664).
KLH-2		Spend the money and cover and your storage, tanks, areas of containment and I'll be satisfied.	The comment is noted. The outdoor hazardous waste container storage area meets the regulatory requirements and doesn't need to be covered. All of the other hazardous waste management units are covered.
CG-1	Mr. Carl Gebert	The proposed permit should be approved. Chevron does good work and are good neighbors.	The comment is noted.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
ND-1	Ms. Nickie Dunng	Please do not renew the permit. The refinery is extremely loud, dangerous & toxic to the community nearby.	This permit is for the operation of two hazardous waste management units and post-closure care of a closed landfarm. DTSC does not permit the refinery production operations. The refinery is zoned M-2 "Heavy Industrial" and operates under a Conditional Use permit from the City of El Segundo and the City is the proper forum for noise complaints. The Chevron Refinery also operates subject to permit(s) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the proper forum for emission complaints. Denial of this permit would not result in closure of the refinery, it would simply result in the required hazardous waste storage and treatment activities being transferred to off-site facilities. However, lack of post-closure care required by the permit for Chevron's former landfarm would represent an unacceptable human health and environmental risk in the El Segundo area.
SW-1	Scott Wilson	I have concerns about containment areas in case of earthquake....?	Waste liquids are properly contained in covered tanks to account for sloshing caused by earthquakes. In addition, secondary containment is provided to prevent potential contamination of the environment that may result from leaks or

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			spills. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has no knowledge of any spills or contamination from the operating hazardous waste management units at the Chevron facility as a result of the earthquakes that occurred in the area in the recent years. With respect to original construction, seismic considerations have been taken into account using the Uniform Building Code (UBC).
SW-2		Why is it stored there at all – in the middle of 10,000,000 people and close to LAX !?!	The Chevron Refinery operates under a Conditional Use Permit from the City of El Segundo and the City is the proper forum for answers on local land use and facility siting questions.
SW-3		#COMPLAINT# the noise from Chevron is getting much louder – especially at night!!!	DTSC does not permit the refinery production operations. The Chevron Refinery operates under a Conditional Use Permit from the City of El Segundo and the City is the proper forum for noise complaints
CP-1	Carole Pauls	Chevron is a good neighbor. I'm sure they deal with hazardous waste with integrity. If there are governmental overseers a permit renewal is fine w/ me Anyway they were here first.	The comment is noted.
JAS-1	Jim and Alexandra	We do not feel that Chevron should be allowed to store	The comment is noted. See also responses

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	Salfity	hazardous waste for up to one year. The facility is too close to residential communities and is harmful for children and families.	to Comment Nos. DWS-1 and DWS-6.
WW-1	Wendy Warren	I want to strongly express that my husband and I oppose this renewal.	The comment is noted.
WW-2		This facility should be moved immediately. It is way too close to the Manhattan Beach community.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is not the agency with the responsibility to address local land use and facility siting complaints. That responsibility is with the City of El Segundo.
WW-3		We OFTEN smell terrible odors coming from that direction. In fact, when I was pregnant with my last son (we have three) I almost had to move the smell bothered me so much.	The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regulatory agency responsible for evaluating odor complaints and identifying sources.
WW-4		Hazardous waste has NO place being this close to residents- particularly growing and developing children	DTSC must be consistent in applying the applicable and regulatory criteria in making its decision on any given permit application to ensure that the environment and public health are adequately protected. Chevron has met all of the requirements for obtaining a permit renewal. See response to comment SW-2 regarding siting issues.
JP-1	John Persell	Chevron is a good company. They should get their permit renewal without delay.	The comment is noted.
CHEV-1	Roger Hahn, David Brod and Robert	A. NOTICE OF COMPLETION & ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TRANSMITTAL	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	Orinion (Chevron)	1. Page 1 of 3: Section entitled "Project Location", the total acres of "640" is incorrect – actually about 980.	change has been made.
CHEV-2		2. Page 2 of 3: At the top of the page, we are told that the Post-Closure Permit was issued in 1994. In "Notice of Final Permit Decision" dated March 29, 1995, from DTSC to Chevron, it states that the permit becomes effective on May 2, 1995.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.
CHEV-3		3. Page 2 of 3, first full paragraph: requires weekly inspections of the landfarm cap. We've been doing cap inspections annually or during & after storms. We do monthly inspections of signs / security.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.
CHEV-4		Page 2 of 3: Third paragraph beginning with The HWSTF. The sentence "Both phases are surrounded by a 3 foot high containment berm" is incorrect. The raised berm is actually a 6 inch curb on the floor of both Phases of the HWSTF. In addition, a 6 foot chain-link fence surrounds the entire HWSTF.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
CHEV-5		<p>Page 2 of 3: Last sentence in the paragraph beginning with "The treatment conducted at this unit is pH adjustment and these units consist of two 650-gallon poly tanks with associated piping and pumps."</p> <p>a. The capacity for each of the poly tanks is 6500 gallons and not 650 gallons</p> <p>b. pH adjustment is not the only type of</p>	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>treatment conducted in the HWSTF. It is, however, the only treatment performed in the two 6500-gallon poly tanks. The following are also performed: container crushing, waste container stabilization, debris decontamination, and container rinsing.</p>	
CHEV-6		<p>5. Page 2 of 3: Third paragraph beginning with The HWSTF. The sentence “Both phases are surrounded by a 3 foot high containment berm” is incorrect. The raised berm is actually a 6 inch curb on the floor of both Phases of the HWSTF. In addition, a 6 foot chain-link fence surrounds the entire HWSTF.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.</p>
CHEV-7		<p>6. Page 2 of 3: Last sentence in the paragraph beginning with “The treatment conducted at this unit is pH adjustment and these units consist of two 650-gallon poly tanks with associated piping and pumps.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The capacity for each of the poly tanks is 6500 gallons and not 650 gallons b. pH adjustment is not the only type of treatment conducted in the HWSTF. It is, however, the only treatment performed in the two 6500-gallon poly tanks. The following are also performed: container crushing, waste container stabilization, debris decontamination, and container rinsing. 	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
CHEV-8		<p>B. INITIAL STUDY</p> <p>1. Page 5 of 34, refinery consists of about 980 ac., not 640 (or “one square mile” as described in the box.)</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.</p>
CHEV-9		<p>2. Page 5 of 34, it is true Standard originally bought 840 acres – but later expanded to about 1800 acres and is now about 980 acres.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.</p>
CHEV-10		<p>3. Page 6 of 34, paragraph 2, monthly cap inspections are referenced; "One change" is referred to regarding monitoring, reducing GW monitoring to semiannually. We've also reduced the frequency of soil-pore gas sampling to annually, and eliminated soil-pore gas annual constituents of concern (formaldehyde, isobutanol, and methyl ethyl ketone).</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.</p>
CHEV-11		<p>4. Page 6 of 34, last two sentences of paragraph 3: closure permit date cited is 1994, should be 1995, expiration date should be May 2, 2005 (see above). Also – remove Texaco from name.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.</p>
CHEV-12		<p>5. Page 6 of 34, paragraph 4: the requirement to sample soil-pore liquids every six months is an error. Lysimeters were sampled twice a year prior to the installation of the multilayer cap. Once the cap was installed (along with new lysimeters) sampling frequency was once a year. During the post-closure period, few samples have been obtained even during the wet season, when attempts</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		are made to sample the lysimeters.	
CHEV-13		6. Page 6 of 34, 6 th paragraph in the section "Project Description" stating with "The operating portion of the permit allows Chevron to operate...". The errors in this paragraph are identical to items 4 & 5 listed above in Section A NOTICE OF COMPLETION & ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TRANSMITTAL.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
CHEV-14		7. Page 7 of 34, 1 st paragraph. The sentence "The only treatment permitted and conducted at the HWSTF is pH adjustment" is incorrect. The following are also performed: container crushing, waste container stabilization, debris decontamination, and container rinsing.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
CHEV-15		8. Page 9 of 34, 3. Air Quality, second paragraph: Annual Constituents of concern, formaldehyde, isobutanol, and methyl ethyl ketone have been eliminated from the program; third paragraph: the soil gas program has changed, eliminating constituents of concern and reducing sampling frequency to annually. Also, formic was never part of the program.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
CHEV-16		9. Page 18 of 34, 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials: In the first paragraph, again "one change" (groundwater sampling frequency) is mentioned. Soil-pore gas frequency reduction represents another change.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
CHEV-17		10. Page 18 of 34, Second paragraph under section 7 "Hazards and Hazardous Materials"	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Typo in second sentence. It states the HWSTA and should be the HWSTF. b. The amount of hazardous waste stored (using gallons as a unit) is more than 2500 gallons per year. In addition, although treatment of liquid waste does not occur very often (e.g once in the last 3-4 years), typically 3000-6000 gallons of liquid waste is treated at a time. c. Photographic developing fluid is not a typical waste handled at the HWSTF. Typical waste include misc. liquid waste, misc. aqueous waste, refinery listed waste, refinery catalyst, misc oily waste and debris. d. All treated liquid waste goes to the refinery waste water treatment system – which is under NPDES permit. (We do not send any waste to POTW) 	changes have been made.
CHEV-18		11. Page 29 of 34, #16 “Utilities and Service Systems” – no box is checked for letter a “Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of applicable Regional Waste Quality Control Board.”	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.
CHEV-19		<p>C. DRAFT HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY PERMIT</p> <p>1. Cover Page: The date noted for the Part "B" Application is March 2, 2005...change to December 11, 2006.</p>	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.
CHEV-20		D. HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY PERMIT	The Department of Toxic Substances

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>ATTACHMENT A 1. Cover – The facility is called “Chevron Products Co., El Segundo Refinery” - the permit should be issued to (owner or operator?) Chevron U.S.A. Inc. or Chevron Products Company, NOT ChevronTexaco, U.S.A. Products Co. (from the old Part A form)</p>	<p>Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.</p>
CHEV-21		<p>2. Page 5 of 18: post closure permit issued on May 2, 1994. Should be May 2, 1995.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.</p>
CHEV-22		<p>3. Page 9 of 18, (b) (2): missing LVMW-DS and LVMW-HD; (c) (2): missing SPL-I. There is no SPL-K, delete.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.</p>
CHEV-23		<p>4. Page 12 of 18, Under ACTIVITY TYPE & DESCRIPTION – it shows “None”. Although there are no waste activities, the current permit “allows” for use of the Landfarm for parking with wording to the effect that we “shall never be allowed to disturb the integrity of the final cover.” It is important for the refinery to be able to use it for parking / lay down of clean materials.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees that parking may occur. However, the activity referred to here is a waste storage, treatment or disposal activity. The unit is closed and such activities are no longer permitted there. A comment on post-closure use of the former landfarm has been added elsewhere in the Permit. At this location in the Permit this language was added. The proposed change has been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
CHEV-24		<p>7. Page 13 of 18</p> <p>a. Unit Name: Hazardous Waste Storage and Treatment Facility (HWSTF) and NOT Hazardous Waste Storage and Treatment Area (HWSTA) Unit.</p> <p>b. Maximum Capacity</p> <p><u>Phase I</u> Eight 4000 gallon roll-off bins Four 6500 gallon Poly Tanks Twenty 650 gallon Flo-bins Six Hundred 55 gallon drums</p> <p><u>Phase II (if put into service after Permit modification)</u> <u>Twenty-four Hundred 55 gallon drums (alone)</u> <u>Six Hundred 55 gallon drums (if bins also present)</u> <u>Nine 4000 gallon roll-off bins</u></p> <p><u>PCB Building</u> <u>Sixty-two 55 gallon drums</u> <u>Or Six Hundred 5 gallon pails</u> <u>Or any combination not to exceed 3413 gallons</u></p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made. See the attached redline/strikeout version of the final Permit.</p>
CHEV-25		<p>E. NEGATIVE DECLARATION</p> <p>1. Project Description, paragraph 1, second to last sentence: Post closure permit was issued in 1995.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.</p>
CHEV-26		<p>2. Project Description, paragraph 2, last sentence: weekly inspection of landfarm cap. We currently do monthly & annual/after storms (see A.3). Weekly seems</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed change has been made.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		excessive – especially in light of an asphalt cap.	
CHEV-27		3. 4 th paragraph in the section entitled “Project Description” starting with the sentence “The HWSTF is a large concrete-surfaced area...”. The errors in this paragraph are identical to items 4 & 5 listed above in Section A of this document - NOTICE OF COMPLETION & ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TRANSMITTAL.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) agrees. The proposed changes have been made.
BC-1	Burke Cochran	Have several properties in the El Porto section of Manhattan Beach. Portions of refinery are visible [sic] from my properties.	The comment is noted.
KM-1	Kathy Miglin	<p>My daughter came down with asthma within one year to moving to our present address. She was 12 at the time. She is now 29 and lives elsewhere. Everytime she comes to visit her asthma goes out of control. She has stayed over night for the past 4 years at Christmas but is debating whether her health can stand staying here.</p> <p>My question is have you done any research on the Refinery causing asthma for those living one block from the facility?</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is not the primary agency with the appropriate scientific or medical staff to investigate public health complaints at this Facility. Persons who may be experiencing health problems should always consult their personal physician to determine the cause of their health problems. Community-wide issues such as a perceived cancer cluster, increased reporting of respiratory problems, etc. should be referred to the County or State health authorities.</p> <p>Sore throats, coughing and respiratory problems may be due in part to air</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			pollution. Air pollution is known to have adverse health effects. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the local government agency responsible for reducing air pollution. Reductions in air emissions will reduce health impacts from air pollution. While air quality in southern California has continually improved despite an enormous increase in population and cars, some regional and localized problems have not been solved. The SCAQMD is committed to focusing its efforts in dealing with this complex issue and will continue to work with the local communities in searching for solutions.
DW-1	Dawn Wilcox	As a resident of Manhattan Beach, I am opposed to any waste storage or treatment activities on the property of the El Segundo Chevron Refinery. These activities should not take place due to bordering residential communities of El Segundo and MB.	See response to comment No. DWS-1.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
DWS-1	David W. Scopp	I am an El Segundo property owner writing to submit my comments regarding the Chevron El Segundo Refinery Draft Permit Renewal ("Permit Renewal"). oppose the Permit Renewal because it constitutes a serious health risk, as well as a public nuisance.[sic]	<p>Whether or not a facility is "safe" encompasses a number of different areas including adequate worker protection, controls and management practices to reduce or eliminate accidental chemical releases, fires, etc, and overall protection of human health and environment.</p> <p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) does not regulate all of the refinery operations. This permit pertains only to storage and treatment of hazardous waste, not to the overwhelming majority of operations at the facility that relate to refining oil. The emissions from the refining operations are regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which deals with the potential for adverse effects from emissions from those operations.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
DWS-2		The storage of hazardous wastes, including PCB's, presents a risk of a substantial and unreasonable interference with the use and enjoyment of land.	<p>The permitting of a hazardous waste facility is governed by federal and state environmental statutes, and implementing regulations. These statutes and regulations take into account the constitutional due process and equal protection principles and the requirement for public participation, while ensuring adequate protection of the environment and public health. Federal and state environmental regulatory agencies reasare responsible to administer and enforce the statutes and regulations.</p> <p>The PCB storage activity addresses PCBs that are already at the refinery but which are being removed. Upon identification of PCBs in existing equipment or materials containing PCBs, these chemicals are properly containerized, labeled and stored in the designated area on-site, prior to being transported to a remote location permitted to be disposed of as hazardous waste. Chevron is not bringing new PCB containing devices or material to the refinery.</p> <p>With respect to storage of toxic chemicals, by far the greatest volume of chemicals that are stored at the refinery are associated with refinery operations permitted under the Conditional Use Permit issued by the City of El Segundo.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
DWS-3		<p>The potential interference is substantial because PCBs are highly toxic; many peer reviewed empirical studies demonstrate that PCBs are carcinogenic and may have adverse reproductive, endocrine, and effects. See , e.g., Kimberly Gehle, MD, MPH; Darlene Johnson, RN, BSN, MA; Felicia Pharagood-Wade, MD, FACEP; Lourdes Rosales-Guevara, MD, Case Studies in Environmental Medicine (CSEM) Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Toxicity (2000). The substantial nature of the interference is also evidenced by the fact that the manufacture of PCBs has been banned since 1977. Id.</p>	<p>The carcinogenic nature of PCBs is one of the reasons why such materials are regulated as a hazardous waste and why the storage of such materials for longer than 90-days at Chevron requires this permit. See also response to comment number DWS-2.</p>
DWS-4		<p>Additionally, the fact that the facility has taken extensive safety measures does not make the interference more substantial. While the risk of interference is lower, a breakdown in the safety measures would nonetheless create a substantial hazard because of the high toxicity of PCBs.</p>	<p>It is the threat of substantial hazard that leads to the requirement that such activities be closely regulated. See also response to comment number DWS-2.</p>
DWS-5		<p>The interference is also unreasonable because the storage of toxic chemicals is not consistent with a highly residential area, such as Manhattan Beach and El Segundo.</p>	<p>The issue of consistency with land uses is a responsibility of the local land use authority, the City of El Segundo. See also response to comment number DWS-2.</p>
DWS-6		<p>Moreover, the area has changed radically from the earlier days of the Chevron plant; the population has grown substantially, more kids live in the area, and families have come to expect a toxic-free environment</p>	<p>The permit is intended to control the threat of specific site operations, including the reduction of PCBs at Chevron, that directly reduces the threat of release of hazardous waste to the environment. Moreover, a significant part of the permit relates to post-closure care of the former landfarm,</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			specifically inspections and environmental monitoring. Such post-closure care is required in order to assure that the hazardous waste materials that were left at the landfarm are not released into the environment.
EE-1	Elizabeth Erickson,	I am the project manager for the Chevron El Segundo Refinery at the Regional Water Quality Control Board in Los Angeles. Our enforcement action at the refinery seeks to improve surface and groundwater quality.	The comment is noted.
EE-2		My colleagues and I were reviewing the DTSC fact sheet on the renewal of the Hazardous Waste Facility (Permit) at this site. We are in the process of making some decisions about landfarming and acceptable surface concentrations of hydrocarbons.	There is no active landfarming at the Chevron refinery. A former landfarm was closed with waste in place.
EE-3		Our question is that the fact sheet describes 70 sampling sites that show no change in soil contamination. Further, it says that "the Landfarm cap has remained secure, and the site is not a threat to the groundwater."	The 70 sampling locations include 10 lysimeter stations with 4 sampling points at depths of 6 inches, 18 inches, 10 feet and 15 feet. There are also 8 groundwater monitoring wells, which are sampled quarterly and finally the are 3 methane wells from which gas samples are collected. On an annual basis these sum to over seventy samples collected.
EE-4		We would like additional information on this [sic] 70 locations where concentrations have not changed.	This information is available in the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			Board files. Your agency receives copies of this data each year from Chevron.
EE-5		Further, we would like more information about the vertical sampling control which convinces you the Old Dune aquifer or the underlying Gage aquifer are not being impacted.	DTSC has not stated that the Old Dune aquifer or the underlying Gage aquifer are not impacted from refinery activities. The twelve years' worth of monitoring data from the vadose zone (both pore liquid and pore gas) leads to the conclusion that the landfarm is not a source of continuing release over that interval. These monitoring reports and the investigation conducted during the closure of the Landfarm have been provided directly to your agency by Chevron. This report has the analytical results from soil samples collected in the Old Dune Sand.
JW-1	John Wilcox	My wife and I are adamantly opposed to allowing the renewal of the Chevron Draft Permit.	The comment is noted. See also response to comment DWS-2.
JW-2		We live in a residential neighborhood located directly across from the refinery on Rosecrans Ave, and feel a permit allowing storage and treatment of hazardous waste at the Chevron facility in El Segundo, CA poses a threat to the communities of Manhattan Beach and El Segundo.	The comment is noted. See also responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
JW-3		Such activities should be limited to remote, unpopulated locations, and should not be allowed to take place in the heart of densely populated cities!	The comment is noted. See also responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.
JC-1	John Clark	I am the owner of a condominium unit in Manhattan Beach and also the president of our Home Owner's Association. I received a mailer on this issue from the DTSC and am writing you during the December 14, 2006 to February 13, 2007 comment period to oppose Chevron El Segundo Refinery's Request for Renewal of Hazardous Waste Facility Permit.	The comment is noted.
JC-2		The proximity of this facility to our building and the frequent noxious odors this facility emits are highly problematic from a Hazardous Waste standpoint.	The comment is noted. See also responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.
JC-3		Please do not renew their permit.	The comment is noted. See also response to comment number DWS-2
BAL-1	Dr. Ben A. Loving	I have lived less than a city block from the refinery for over 20 years and found them to be good citizens and a good contribution to the community.	The comment is noted.
GG-1	Constance Gangadharan	I am the owner of a condominium unit in Manhattan Beach and also the president of our Home Owner's Association. I received a mailer on this issue from the DTSC and am writing you during the December 14, 2006 to February 13, 2007 comment period to oppose Chevron El Segundo Refinery's	See responses to comments No. JC-1, JC-2 and JC-3.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		Request for Renewal of Hazardous Waste Facility Permit. The proximity of this facility to our building and the frequent noxious odors this facility emits are highly problematic from a Hazardous Waste standpoint. Please do not renew their permit.	
JR-1	Jason Reid	As a current resident of Manhattan Beach, I received your fact sheet regarding Chevron's request to renew their hazardous waste permit. I am not an expert in understanding the true risks associated with such a facility, but am cognizant that the best measures are being taken to contain potential harm to the community around it.	The comment is noted.
JR-2		What I found surprisingly omitted [sic] from the fact sheet was any mention as to why or for what benefit, such a facility needs to be in such a dense residential area?	See response to comment number DWS-2.
JR-3		Is there a distinct advantage to placing the facility along the coastline?	See response to comment number DWS-2.
JR-4		I don't find that any current resident is pleased with the simple proximity of having such a facility near their homes.	The comment is noted.
JR-5		I would like to petition to have their hazardous [sic] waste permit denied. Please let me know what my best available means are of doing so.	The comment is noted. See also response to comment number DWS-2.

NO.	COMMENTS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
DS-1	Dave Singleton (Native American Heritage Commission)	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. The Native American Heritage Commission is the state's Trustee Agency for Native American Cultural Resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per CEQA guidelines § 15064.5(b)(c). In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE)', and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:</p> <p>Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). The record search will determine:</p> <p>If a part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.</p> <p>If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.</p> <p>If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE</p> <p>If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report</p>	<p>A records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) in August 2005 of all recorded archaeological sites and survey reports within a 0.5 mile radius of the El Segundo Refinery (see Appendix A). Federal state and local historic listings were reviewed along with historic maps. In addition, this background research was supplemented by an Internet search for relevant historical information. The research revealed that the listings of the National Register of Historic Places, California Historical Landmarks, California State Historic Resources Inventory, California Points of Historical Interest, and Los Angeles County Landmarks include no properties within the refinery. One historic site, P-186856, is recorded at the outer edge of the 0.5-mile radius. Because the proposed project activities will occur entirely within the refinery boundaries, site P-186856 would not be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed project. Based on the results of these records searches, the proposed project will not cause an adverse change in the significance of a resource listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.</p> <p>The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.</p> <p>The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.</p> <p>' Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity who may have additional cultural resource information. <p>Please provide this office with the following citation format to assist with the Sacred Lands File search request: USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle citation with name, township, range and section;.</p> <p>The NAHC advises the use of Native American Monitors to ensure proper identification and care given cultural resources that may be discovered. The NAHC recommends that contact be made with Native American Contacts on the attached list to get their input on potential project impact, particularly the contacts of the on the list.</p> <p>Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.</p> <p>Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan</p>	

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f).</p> <p>In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.</p> <p>Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.</p> <p>* CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens.</p> <p>Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines mandate procedures to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.</p> <p>Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in § 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines, when significant</p>	

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning.	
DS-2		<p>Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). The record search will determine:</p> <p>If a part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.</p> <p>If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.</p>	The comment is noted.
DS-3		<p>If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE</p> <p>If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.</p>	The comment is noted.
DS-4		<p>Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.</p> <p>* CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the NAHC, to assure the</p>	There is no need to include such provisions or mitigations because there are no proposed disturbances to the ground surface in the permit renewal application. Furthermore, there is no evidence of native American graves at this location from previous construction work.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources	
GT-1	Greg Tai	I am completely against renewing the hazardous waste facility at the Chevron Plant in El Segundo, CA.	The comment is noted. See also response to comment number DWS-2.
GT-2		My thoughts are that your whole facility should be moved to the desert. With all your & pollution & noise & smell in the middle of such a populous area. Stop building or, more to the point, get out of here completely. This is no place for a refinery. Your noise, smell, & sight are poisonous.	The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is not the agency with the responsibility for local land use, siting, emissions or noise complaints. See also responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.
GT-3		I respect the fact that your company was started a long time ago to benefit all of us but times change and you should change with them. This area is to [sic] populous to accommodate a full scale refinery & hydrogen Plant & Toxic dump and who knows what else.	DTSC is not permitting the entire refinery operations. The proposed permit is for the continued operation of existing hazardous waste management units. These are a small portion of the overall refinery. See also responses to comments ND-1 and DWS-2.
GTS-4		Your profits would easily [sic] finance [sic] a move of your whole total refinery move out of El Segundo.	DTSC is not the owner or operator of the refinery.
GST-5		Granted, your plant was here long before many of us but that is no reason to pollute (smell, noise, sight). One question, who would be for a hazardous waste facility? No one in their right minds!	The comment is noted. See also responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.
DP-1	David Parfitt	Although, it seems that water and waste controls are in place; however, has there needs to be an investigation	The ground water immediately under the Chevron facility has been de-designated by

NO.	COMMENTS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>of the drinking water, wells feeding the neighboring cities. Could they have not been contaminated...already, and the people are ignoring the possible problems as to not raising an issue to the cities politicians, or are the politicians and high officials turning the other cheek. I believe that the neighboring cities water system and wells need to be investigated to see if there is a problem with water contamination contributed by the refinery.</p>	<p>the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). In other words, the LARWQCB has determined that the water is not satisfactory as a municipal water supply. The nearest municipal water wells are on the other side of the salt water intrusion barrier and draw from deeper aquifers than the uppermost aquifer immediately under Chevron. This is an artificial groundwater "mound" created by injection of water. The "mound's" purpose is to prevent salt water intrusion into the deeper aquifers of the West Coast Basin. The contamination from the refinery is mostly confined to the uppermost aquifer. There is considerable contamination under the Chevron El Segundo refinery. Chevron is actively removing this contamination.</p>
DP-2		<p>It could be possible that the residents of the neighboring cities wish to ignore a possible problem that could affect their personal investment interest in living so closely to the beach.</p>	<p>The comment is noted.</p>
DP-3		<p>Should this question raise a few eyebrows and trigger a problem for those who benefit by the oil business, or is this question raised a question to be swept under the sand?</p>	<p>The comment is noted.</p>
CEK-1	Mr. Carl E. Knutson	<p>I have no problem with this action. Myself and partners own 5 buildings north of El Segundo Blvd. for the past</p>	<p>The comment is noted.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		30 years and we have never had any problems with Chevron Refinery.	
JCGM-1	Mr. John C. G. Moore	The Chevron Refinery is an excellent neighbor ever since my father built a 4-plex unit next to them over 45 years ago. They have a very good safety and compliance record. Please renew the hazardous Waste Facility Permit.	The comment is noted.
MM-1	Michael Malkasian	El Segundo has an abnormally high rate of cancer – cluster cancer.	The comment is noted.
MM-2		When the refinery was constructed in the early 1900s it was a rural area. Now, almost 100 years later, South Bay is densely populated. I suggest that every and anything that can be done to eliminate hazardous materials at the refinery is done. PLEASE CLOSE THE HAZARDOUS WASTE FACILITY.	See responses to comment numbers ND-1, KLH-1, and DWS-2.
PUBLIC HEARING			
MS-1	Marcella Solorzano	I've been living in El Segundo for four years now, and I wanted to ask some questions for the record. I found out about this meeting through the DTSC website, and I guess that because of the public participation requirement of a quarter-mile radius notification, I'm not within the quarter-mile radius. I guess one of my first comments or questions or requests is to be added to the mailing list and to extend the notification for any additional either EPA or DTSC projects to include at least half a mile because a quarter-mile only covers, I	DTSC will look into expanding the mailing list radius for future projects. DTSC will look into using both the El Segundo Herald and Beach Reporter for future notices.

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>suppose, partially the industrial -- you know, the refinery is closer to the industrial part of El Segundo, and it doesn't cover many residents -- I mean, hardly any residents. So I guess it would have been a larger turnout if more people were notified. My second comment on that public participation requirement was that it was posted on the Beach Reporter. I don't read the Beach Reporter. There's also the El Segundo Herald which a lot of people get Thursdays. That would have been a good posting, but -- yeah, if I wasn't browsing the internet by chance, I would have never found out. No notice is posted here at the library or in the mail or -- yeah, anywhere else.</p>	
MS-2		<p>I guess my other comment too is, you know, I only see four residents of El Segundo, and I think the lady may not be from here, from El Segundo; but I guess, you know, this is - I've lived here for four years, and the only notification I've received from Chevron was about two or three months ago when you had a brief spill of something, and it just spilled all over my car, and I got a free car wash. But, yeah, I actually don't know much about what goes on in their refinery, and I know this is part of DTSC, and I know that you guys are responsible, but I guess this comment could go to Chevron that I don't know whether residents really are aware of other things that go on in there. I know this is a ten-year permit, so every ten years well hear about something like this because DTSC has a great public participation program, but I don't know how Chevron tells residents about what's going on.</p>	<p>The "spillage" you describe was related to refinery operations. Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is not the agency with the responsibility for refinery operations. DTSC will recommend to Chevron that they consider expanding their community outreach program.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
MS-3		<p>Maybe I'm missing it and I'm not seeing it, but if there are any other either public forums or newsletters or -- I don't know what other forms of notification, information methods that you have for the community that I'm not aware of, I guess I would want that information or I would want to know where to get it. I've been at the Chevron website, and I haven't seen anything. I think I did some research to see what kind of crisis planning systems you have for release, spills, transportation accidents, and I did not see anything on the website either, but this kind of shows how little informed I am of what's going on there.</p>	<p>The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) does not require that Chevron maintain any particular public forum or issue newsletters with respect to overall refinery operations. DTSC is not the agency with the responsibility for refinery operations. However, there are specific public notification and meeting requirements for hazardous waste facility permit related events, such as permit modifications. Such requirements are primarily described in the California Code of Regulations, title 22, sections 66270.4266271.9, 66271.10, and 66271.11. With respect to hazardous waste management, Chevron has included a Contingency Plan and description of their emergency procedures in the Operation Plan, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 22, sections 66264.50 to 66264.56. DTSC will also recommend to Chevron that they evaluate their website with respect to your comments.</p>
MS-4		<p>I don't know what other forms of notification information methods that you have for the community that I'm not aware of, I guess I would want that information or I would want to know where to get when you have spills like the one that happened a couple weeks ago, two or three months ago, that was the only time I ever saw some kind of notification. And When I asked someone</p>	<p>See response to comment MS-3.</p>

NO.	COMMENTER	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		while I was getting my voucher for my free cash wash, they just couldn't tell me what happened or about health effects or -- I know there wasn't any, but it wasn't very informational.	
MS-5		My last question would be whether in that -- whether you process or treat chemicals on site. You know, its a little confusing. I know there are three facilities, you store PCB's, they are transported off site and probably treated off site; but do you burn things on site and dispose of things on site or where does it go? I mean, its stored, its transported -- some of it is transported off site. I just wanted to know if you treat them right here.	There is no disposing or burning of hazardous materials on site. Treatments involve mechanical processes such as container crushing and container rinsing. Waste chemicals are blended to change acidic or basic liquid into neutral liquids for further treatment at the on-site wastewater treatment facility. DTSC has reviewed these processes and determined that these activities can be safely carried out without any threat to human health or the environment.