

# **Scoping Summary Report**

## **Environmental Impact Statement for the West Coast Introduction of the MV-22**

**Final Report**  
**March 2001**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This scoping summary report presents the information from the scoping activities conducted for the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the West Coast Introduction of the MV-22. This document identifies the primary issues and concerns raised by the public during the scoping period. The comments provided by the public will be considered during the technical analysis and preparation of the EIS. This report contains all verbal and written comments submitted during the 57-day public scoping period (6 October 2000 through 1 December 2000). Although the scoping period officially concluded on 1 December 2000, public comments were accepted until 8 December 2000. All comments were categorized into major issue or resource areas and the frequency of comments received from the respective communities are included in the following tables.

**Table ES-1. Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at Edwards AFB**

<i>Commenting Category</i>	<i>Resource Areas</i>															
	Airfields and Airspace	Land Use	Socioeconomics	Community Facilities/Services	Transportation	Air Quality	Noise	Infrastructure and Utilities	Cultural Resources	Hazardous Materials	Topography, Geology, and Soils	Water Resources	Biological Resources	Visual Resources	Safety and Environmental Health	Environmental Justice
Federal Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
State Agencies	2	1	?	?	?	1	?	1	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?
Local Agencies	7	3	6	1	?	?	?	3	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Local Groups/ Organizations	2	3	2	4	?	?	?	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Individuals	?	3	3	?	?	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	1	?	?	?
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	?	<b>2</b>	?	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	?	?	<b>1</b>	?	?	?

**Table ES-2. Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at NAF El Centro**

Commenting Category	Resource Areas															
	Airfields and Airspace	Land Use	Socioeconomics	Community Facilities/Services	Transportation	Air Quality	Noise	Infrastructure and Utilities	Cultural Resources	Hazardous Materials	Topography, Geology, and Soils	Water Resources	Biological Resources	Visual Resources	Safety and Environmental Health	Environmental Justice
Federal Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
State Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?
Local Agencies	2	2	?	?	1	?	3	1	?	?	?	1	?	?	?	?
Local Groups/Organizations	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Individuals	1	?	2	?	?	?	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>?</b>

**Table ES-3. Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Yuma**

Commenting Category	Resource Areas															
	Airfields and Airspace	Land Use	Socioeconomics	Community Facilities/Services	Transportation	Air Quality	Noise	Infrastructure and Utilities	Cultural Resources	Hazardous Materials	Topography, Geology, and Soils	Water Resources	Biological Resources	Visual Resources	Safety and Environmental Health	Environmental Justice
Federal Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
State Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Local Agencies	1	1	2	5	2	?	?	?	?	1	?	?	1	?	?	?
Local Groups/Organizations	1	?	1	?	?	1	?	1	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Individuals	2	1	2	?	?	1	2	2	1	?	?	?	1	?	3	?
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>?</b>

**Table ES-4. Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Miramar**

Commenting Category	Resource Areas															
	Airfields and Airspace	Land Use	Socioeconomics	Community Facilities/Services	Transportation	Air Quality	Noise	Infrastructure and Utilities	Cultural Resources	Hazardous Materials	Topography, Geology, and Soils	Water Resources	Biological Resources	Visual Resources	Safety and Environmental Health	Environmental Justice
Federal Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
State Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	1	?	1	1	?	1	2	?	1	?
Local Agencies	4	?	?	?	?	2	2	?	?	1	?	?	?	?	2	?
Local Groups/ Organizations	19	1	2	2	?	7	13	?	?	?	?	1	3	?	12	?
Individuals	36	?	3	1	?	12	52	?	1	?	1	1	5	?	40	?
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>?</b>

**Table ES-5. Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Camp Pendleton**

Commenting Category	Resource Areas															
	Airfields and Airspace	Land Use	Socioeconomics	Community Facilities/Services	Transportation	Air Quality	Noise	Infrastructure and Utilities	Cultural Resources	Hazardous Materials	Topography, Geology, and Soils	Water Resources	Biological Resources	Visual Resources	Safety and Environmental Health	Environmental Justice
Federal Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
State Agencies	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	1	1		1	2	?	1	?
Local Agencies	2	?	?	?	?	1	3	1	?	?	?	?	?	?	2	?
Local Groups/ Organizations	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Individuals	13	?	3	1	?	5	28	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	10	?
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>?</b>

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	ES-1
1.0 SCOPING PROCESS.....	1
2.0 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS.....	1
3.0 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FORMAT.....	2
4.0 SCOPING PROCESS RESULTS .....	2

## **TABLES**

ES-1	Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at Edwards AFB .....	ES-1
ES-2	Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at NAF El Centro.....	ES-2
ES-3	Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Yuma.....	ES-2
ES-4	Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Miramar.....	ES-3
ES-5	Frequency of Issues Raised During Scoping Process at MCAS Camp Pendleton.....	ES-3
1	Schedule of Scoping Meetings and Attendance.....	1
2	Public Comments Received During the Scoping Process.....	2

## **APPENDICES**

A	NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT USMC PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE (PAO) PRESS RELEASE NOI PRESS RELEASE IN SELECTED LOCAL NEWSPAPERS
B	TRANSCRIPTS FROM SCOPING MEETINGS
C	PUBLIC COMMENT LETTERS

[This page intentionally left blank.]

## **1.0 SCOPING PROCESS**

The public scoping period for the West Coast Introduction of the MV-22 EIS officially began on 6 October 2000, with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register (see Appendix A). The NOI conveyed to the public the intent of the Department of the Navy to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed action: The West Coast introduction of the MV-22 to the 3<sup>d</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Marine Aircraft Wings. The NOI also announced the dates, times, and locations of the public scoping meetings. In addition, the Marine Corps Public Affairs Office issued a press release announcing the dates, times, locations, and purpose of the scoping meetings on 4 October 2000 (Appendix A). Advertisements announcing the scoping meetings were also placed in the following local newspapers on 6 October 2000: Antelope Valley Press, Imperial Valley Press, Yuma Daily Sun, San Diego Union Tribune, North County Times, Orange County Register, and Los Angeles Times (Appendix A). The 57-day public scoping period officially ended on 1 December 2000. However, public comments were accepted until 8 December 2000.

The intent of the scoping process was to provide the opportunity for local communities, government agencies, special interest groups, and the general public to learn about the Marine Corps' proposal and to offer several ways for those interested to express their thoughts regarding the proposal. To accomplish this, seven scoping meetings were held.

## **2.0 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS**

Public scoping meetings were held from 25 October – 9 November 2000, at the seven locations shown in Table 1. The meetings were held in communities near each of the potential basing installations. Two meetings were held for both Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar and MCAS Camp Pendleton, each in a different community.

**Table 1. Schedule of Scoping Meetings and Attendance**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Attendance</i>
25 October 2000	Desert Inn Lancaster, CA	33
1 November 2000	County Administration Center El Centro, CA	13
2 November 2000	Yuma Main Library Yuma, AZ	36
6 November 2000	Torrey Pines High School San Diego, CA	64
7 November 2000	San Clemente High School San Clemente, CA	26
8 November 2000	Mira Mesa High School San Diego, CA	31
9 November 2000	Fallbrook Community Center Fallbrook, CA	20

### **3.0 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FORMAT**

The public scoping meetings were designed with an “open house” format to create a comfortable, more informative atmosphere. Using this format, public participants could speak individually to Marine Corps personnel and other members of the project team. The goals of these meetings were to introduce the communities to the EIS process, provide available project information, answer questions from community members, and solicit public input on important issues and concerns. Over 200 community members attended the meetings, presenting important and challenging questions to the project team.

The meeting format consisted of a sign-in table at the scoping facility entrance and several information stations, each staffed by knowledgeable Marine Corps personnel and/or other members of the project team. Attendees visiting the information stations were provided the opportunity to observe a video of the MV-22 and a continuous play Powerpoint presentation which provided a brief discussion of the proposed action, alternatives, and NEPA process.

### **4.0 SCOPING PROCESS RESULTS**

Meeting participants were offered the opportunity and encouraged to provide their verbal comments directly to a stenographer during each meeting for inclusion in the official scoping record. Transcripts from each of the scoping meetings are presented in Appendix B. Comment forms were also available for attendees to submit written comments. All comments, both written and verbal will receive the same consideration during the preparation of the EIS. Written comments were accepted at the scoping meetings and by mail throughout the public scoping period (Appendix C). The number of comments received by commenting category is summarized for each installation in Table 2.

**Table 2. Public Comments Received During the Scoping Process**

<i>Commenting Category</i>	<i>Installation</i>				
	<i>Edwards AFB</i>	<i>NAF El Centro</i>	<i>MCAS Yuma</i>	<i>MCAS Miramar</i>	<i>MCAS Camp Pendleton</i>
Federal Agencies	0	0	0	1	0
State Agencies	3	2	1	4	3
Local Agencies	8	4	4	4	2
Local Groups/ Organizations	9	1	3	16	3
Individuals	6	3	10	63	31
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>39</b>

The most frequently raised issues during the scoping period varied from installation to installation. With respect to Edwards Air Force Base (AFB) the major issues raised were regarding airfields and airspace, land use, and socioeconomics. At Naval Air Facility (NAF) El Centro comments most frequently expressed concerns about airfields and airspace and noise. Regarding MCAS Yuma, comments most frequently expressed concerns about airfields and

airspace, socioeconomics, and community facilities/services. MCAS Miramar commentors were primarily concerned with airfields and airspace, air quality, noise and vibration, and safety and environmental health. Regarding MCAS Camp Pendleton the public comments were focused on noise and vibration, airfields and airspace, and safety and environmental health. Tables ES-1 – ES-5 summarize the frequency of issues raised by resource area.

During the preparation of the EIS, the Marine Corps will consider the issues and concerns raised by the public during the scoping process. Based on the results of the public scoping process, the EIS will include detailed analyses of the potential resource-specific impacts (e.g., aircraft noise and vibration, flight operations, and safety) for each of the project alternatives. The EIS will include a matrix comparing the environmental impacts associated with each of the alternatives.

[This page intentionally left blank.]