

Harold Singer - Subject: [REVISED] TOTAL HOUSEHOLD HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM FILTRATION SYSTEM LEADS & COMMENT ON THE DRAFT CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER [ITEMS "Fifth", "Sixth" & "(15)" are added]

From: Robert Conaway <rdconaway@gmail.com>
To: <Singer@waterboards.ca.gov>, <LKemper@waterboards.ca.gov>, <HSinger@wate...>
Date: 7/11/2011 4:45 PM
Subject: Subject: [REVISED] TOTAL HOUSEHOLD HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM FILTRATION SYSTEM LEADS & COMMENT ON THE DRAFT CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER [ITEMS "Fifth", "Sixth" & "(15)" are added]
CC: <dnormdiaz@gmail.com>, <jbashaw@waterboards.ca.gov>, <giddyuphorse@msn....>

First, after the first CAC [Community Advisory Committee] meeting in Hinkley, I recall Drew Page [one of PG&E's attorneys] telling me that there were some difficulties locating a Chromium 6 filtration system feasible for the entire water use of a home in the Hinkley area. Since the availability of effective technologies is important to the DRAFT CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER on the PG&E plume clean-up & protection of residents' health (and the comment period ends on the 12th or 13th of July), I spent some time on the concern. At times, I find things on the internet that others don't readily do on their first effort. So here are some leads:

- (1) <http://www.radiantlifecatalog.com/product/DRINKING-WATER-PURIFICATION-SYSTEM/water-purification-systems> [whole house system runs about \$1,600]
- (2) <http://www.chromium-6.com/>
- (3) <http://www.waterfilters-camping-water-purifier.com/Water-filters-blog.html>
- (4) <http://www.home-water-purifiers-and-filters.com/chromium-6-water-filter.php>
- (5) <http://www.freshwatersystems.com/s-279-chromium-in-water.aspx>
- (6) <http://www.lifeionizers.com/blog/news-updates/general/water-filtration-system/>
- (7) <http://www.h2odistributors.com/hexa-chromium.asp>
- (8) <http://www.aquatell.com/knowledge-center/hexavalent-chromium-vi-drinking-water>
- (9) <http://wellwaterpurificationsystems.com/tag/chromium-6/>
- (10) <http://thewaterfilterladyblog.com/tag/chromium-6/>
- (11) http://www.nsf.org/consumer/drinking_water/contaminant_chromium.asp?program=WaterTre.
- (12) <http://www.bigberkeywaterfilters.com/wordpress/heavy-metals/chromium-water-contamination/>
- (13) <http://www.kinetico.com/press-release/kinetico-protects-families-from-chromium6.aspx>
- (14) <http://www.starlingwatersystems.com/>
- (15) <http://www.zerowater.com/> [added on--small scale]

[PARTIAL LISTING]

Second, I have a suggestions since this CAC process has started--use some of us as resources. Some of us are trained to research and have access to resources many people in the general population do not. Maybe an update on what is being searched for is the very sort of thing the CAC process and committee members can help with?

Third, I would ask Mr. Hunter of PG&E to get a copy of this email to the other CAC members. As of yet, I do not have the other CAC members' email addresses. Maybe they have some additional information and suggestions before the comment period runs.

Fourth, as a resident of Hinkley, I agree with the proposed order and thank the Lahontan Board for its

attention to detail. Whole house water is necessary due to the potential projection of chromium tainted water through swamp coolers, showers and typical rural area water use (water for pets, livestock and edible food gardening). It is a reasonable interim step until such time the plume can be fully characterized and the water contaminant level abated of the areas affected, as it allows people to safely stay in their homes, which preserves the community of Hinkley and reverses the brownfielding trend. The treatment should be at some point before the water supply broadcasts into the household spigots and lines. If an interim storage tank is needed in line from the treatment unit (and then the tank feeds into the house system and spigots surrounding the house), that would be a minimal good faith step, if that is the only effective way to make the filtration system work. If it can be done without a tank (as I sense is possible) then that would be acceptable as well.

Fifth, I continue to object to the use of an area wide background chromium standard. My well was ND for total chromium and hexavalent chromium just 4 years ago, as was the case for many. My well is on the West side between the plant and the river. My well is 265 ft down and it is showing signs of chromium plume clean-up side-effects as I said would happen in my appeal filed December 7, 2006, which was rejected. In the "Site History" of the proposed order, the fact of the earlier appeal and its rejection should be listed in the June 10, 2011 Draft for Public Review & Comment" and under the "Plume Migration", the new hits (or detections, such as my well) should be listed.

Sixth, on November 12, 2010, I filed an appeal to the rescission of waste discharge requirements for the PG&E Source Area & Central Area In-Situ Remediation projects [Board Order R6v-2006-0046 & Board Order R6V-2006-0054] & their replacement with Board Order R6V-2008-0014 & the refusal to do a SEIR for the effect of PG&E's ongoing environment-damaging remediation strategies, which I challenged over 4 years ago as irresponsible. What is the status of the appeal and doesn't it potentially bear on the order and directions taken should the order be adopted?

Bob Conaway
CAC Member
22562 Aquarius Road
Hinkley CA 92347

If you receive this message in error please notify us immediately at (760) 256-0603 or by e-mail at rdconaway@gmail.com