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GITA KAPAHI: Good afternoon, everyone.
We're glad you can all join us today. We're excited about the opportunity to have this discussion in kind of an informal setting so we can brainstorm and just have kind of an intimate conversation at each of our respective tables.

I am a very strong believer in collaboration, and through that collaborative process so frequently come creative solutions that, perhaps, have not been thought about before.

My name is Kimberly Cox. I'm the chair of the Lahontan Board. We have with us Don Jardine and Peter Pumphrey right here. So we hope you all enjoy this format. We would like to hear your feedback later on how you like this process that we're introducing to you today.

And with that, I will turn it over to Pete to give us some introductory comments.

PETE PUMPHREY: Thank you.
As Kim earlier said, we're -- as a board, we've been really interested in the idea of encouraging all of the people who have an interest, and our stakeholders, in the situation, and Hinkley, to talk with each other, to meet with each other, to share information, share ideas and hopefully come up with a plan, a process that they're all
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invested in rather than having the board come and say, "This is what you're going to do." We have board members. There are three board members here today. And we're just here to listen and to ask questions and to hopefully kind of prompt the discussion.

We're not here today in any decision-making capacity whatsoever. We're not going to make any decisions today. No decisions are going to be made today about anything. And did I mention that we're not here to come to any final decision about anything?

No member of the Board is here to speak on behalf of the Board. We're here as individuals only. We're here to listen as I said. We cannot make any commitments on behalf of the Board; if it sounds like we have, we made a mistake, 'cause we haven't. We can't make any promises on behalf of the Board and don't intend to do that.

The whole point of this discussion is to see where people are in terms of some questions that are going to be posed, to ask questions about that. To see if there are ways to find consensus, either about parts of some of these questions or, perhaps, consensus with respect to the question as a whole and to see if there's a way that issues that are related to the CAO can be talked about and maybe worked out or worked on by us as a group.

If there is consensus, that will have to go to the

Board. In other words, if you all reach an agreement and we all reach an agreement here today on something or consensus on something, that doesn't mean it's a done deal. It gets presented to the Board. The quorum of the Board will meet. And the quorum of the Board will then act on that recommendation. And it may or may not be included as a part of the final CAO.

Personally, and on behalf of the rest of the Board, I'm really, really glad to see you all. I have been impressed over the last five years when I've been on the Board with the commitment of all the people in this community, in this room, to working on this problem. I've been really impressed with your tenacity. I've been really impressed with people's creativity and their willingness to do a lot of hard work. So this is kind of an extension of that. I want to tell you I'm happy to be here, and I'm really glad to see this taking place.

GITA KAPAHI: Thank you both.
So today we're going to mix things up a little bit. This is a little out of your comfort zone. I have prepared some directions, instructions, just general information. And if you'll bear with me, $I$ want to go through all of that so everyone's clear on how we're going to do this. So I have to read it, and I apologize. It's long.
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So good afternoon. I'm Gita Kapahi. I'm the director of Public Participation for the State Regional Water Boards. And I'm going to facilitate the workshop today. If you have any problems with the process or anything, it's my fault. I'm the one that's doing this at the request of the Board.

As we mentioned, we've got three of our board members here today. In addition, we have Pati, the Board's executive officer. Lauri Kemper, the Board's assistant executive officer and a number of staff persons from the Board. Some staff, such as Lauri, Anne Holden and Lisa -- want to put your hands up -- are part of what is referred to as a prosecution team, which put out the draft cleanup order. Others, such as Doug Smith and Rich Booth are part of the Board's advisory team. They play a neutral role in providing advice to the Board.

We're here today at the request of the Board. And today's workshop is meant to generate discussion on the draft Cleanup and Abatement Order and see if there are ways we can come to a working consensus on what should be in the final order. As you may recall, a draft order was issued by the Board's prosecution team back in February. It went out for public comment, and six comment letters were received by the end of the comment period.

Subsequently, the Board's advisory sent a request
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for additional information to the Board's prosecution team, PG\&E and the IRMP manager. That additional information was submitted last week on May 21st. We have copies of all the comments submitted, and they'll be at the tables you'll be working at in case they may be in assistance in today's discussion.

The Board's advisory team has identified six main policy issues -- and they were in the notice for this workshop today -- where they feel there is substantial differences between the various interested parties.

The goal of this workshop is to facilitate discussion on these six main issues to help parties, perhaps, reach consensus, perhaps, where possible.

As was stated, the Board members here today are just here to listen, ask questions and help facilitate the discussion. After today's workshop, the Board's advisory team will be revising the draft CAO, taking into consideration the comments received on the draft order, the responses to the request for additional information and any consensus reached today.

If there are substantial changes made to the draft, those changes will go out for additional public comment at the end of July. It is our goal to hold a public hearing on the revised CAO at the September Board meeting, which will be back here.
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What we're asking you to do today may be outside of your comfort zone as I mentioned, and it's different from the way these meetings are typically conducted. So I'm asking for you to come to this with an open mind as no one has anything to lose but participating in this. And potentially, we might find some areas of commonality.

The Board and I appreciate you being here and your participation today.

Process: What this is and what this isn't.
What this is: A brainstorming session. It is not a settlement agreement. No one is giving up any rights to petition the final order. The goal, what this is, is to reach consensus on different points already brought up. It is not an opportunity to make new comments. This is an opportunity to generate discussion, but no decision-making by Board members.

The questions are intended to help dialogue -generate dialogue to hopefully reach consensus. Any outcomes from today as was mentioned will be considered by the Board, but there are no guarantees that the final order will contain these.

The hope is to educate folks on key terms. This is not a debate where anyone needs to win a particular point. If there are disagreements or we can't reach consensus, we ask that the note takers note where we're
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close or what the final outcome is.

It's important to understand folks' differences as much as the disagreements. Bear with me, sorry. This is all key.

The participants -- this is where it gets a little different. I'm going to divide you up into three tables, which I've assigned. Each table will have a facilitator and a note taker. There's also a timekeeper for the whole group.

Because of the way the room is configured, I'm going to have two groups in here and one in the sagebrush. So table one will be here. Table two will be over there. Table three will be in the sagebrush room. We'll have two hours to discuss the six questions. So there's not a lot of time. Each question will have 15 minutes of discussion followed by five-minute wrap-up.

Note takers will record any technical questions, and those will be responded to after we reconvene from the break. So we won't get into any dialogue on the technical questions.

The rules: The facilitator is a neutral that will assist in the process. For table one, the facilitator is myself with Rae Bell as my note taker. Table two, Patty is going to facilitate with Sue as the note taker. Table tree is Dough Smith with Kim as a note taker. And you
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folks will be in sagebrush. The facilitators will ensure that each person has an opportunity to comment and will go around the table and ask each person to weigh in. Participants have the option to pass. If you don't wish to say anything, you can pass.

For example, for question one, prescriptive performance, hybrid or transition requirements, each person will state their preference. In round two, each person will say why they made their choice. And in round three, each participant will say for which part of the Cleanup and Abatement Order this is most important as it relates to the issue. And in round four, we'll see if there's any ideas to bring different positions closer to consensus. No one is bound by anything they say today. The goal today is simply to create discussion.

Because of our time limits, the facilitators may impose time limits on your comments and ask you to be concise with your thoughts. The Board members and their advisors will not be participating in the dialogue, but rather are here to listen, ask questions and help facilitate the discussion. As we said before, no decision-making by board members today.

The note taker is neutral and records all dialogue and ideas without modification or interpretation or attribution as to who said what. They are to record any
technical questions for later discussion. Table participants, your role is to exchange ideas and brainstorm. All comments have value. No comments are right or wrong. You're there to see if you can find common ground on the six questions and issues to be open-minded and listen to ideas from other participants. The time keeper will note the start, the 10 -minute mark, 15-minute mark and 5-minute wrap-up. And then we've got some definitions just so that everybody is on the same page.

These are examples that are not being advocated for but prescriptive requirement, we wanted to make sure folks understood. For example, draw the three point line parts pavilion chromium boundary by connecting monitoring wells within a half mile of each other. That's a prescriptive.

Performance requirement: Draw the three point one hard chromium boundary by using all available geologic information and best professional judgement.

A Hybrid requirement: Draw the three point ppb Chromium boundary by connecting monitoring wells within a half mile of each other in this area and by using geological information in these other areas.

Transition from Prescriptive to Performance:
Transitions are done over time, such as over four
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quarters. You would potentially move from the Prescriptive to the Performance. For example, each quarter reduce the mapping requirements quarter mile to connect wells and defer geologic information and judgment. Just as an examples.

And then $I$ need to ask, does anyone have any objections or any concerns about my process? And this is what I made up. Questions? Clarification?

MALE SPEAKER: Just a question. So we're going to do that today, this afternoon?

GITA KAPAHI: Yeah.
MALE SPEAKER: How does it transition to the evening?

GITA KAPAHI: So then we will break into these three groups, talk amongst ourselves. The note takers will summarize what they hear. Then a group of us will take all of that during the break and try and synthesize what we heard, see if there's any commonality and then come back at 7 o'clock tonight, and we'll talk about it as a larger group. And then we'll also get into the technical questions and see where we are. And then we'll do a wrap-up and next steps.

Is that okay?
And then, randomly, let me see what else I have. So we've got -- now, your table assignments. So I based --
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I did this randomly somewhat. I based it on the RSVP that I thought I had. There may be some folks that are not on the list. There may be some folks on the list that are not here. If you are not -- if $I$ don't say your name, please let me know, and I will assign you a table.

So Barbara Ray, table one. Betty Hernandez, table two. Daron Banks, who I do not see, table three. Dave Cheney, table one. Ed Duitsman, table two. Billy Hernandez, table three. Jim Steinberg, table two. John Turner, table three. Jon Quass, table three. Lester White, table one. Nick Grill, table two. Larry Griep, table three. Omar Nassar, table one. Penny Harper, table two. Roberta Walker, table three. Anne Holden, table one. Lisa Dernbach, table two. Lauri Kemper, table three. AnnaKatherine Benedict, table one. Rich Booth, you are a floater. Rich is there to answer any technical questions, get any coffee. I don't drink coffee. So any ways, if there's a need at the table, you can go get it. If you need more paper, he can go get it.

Dough Smith, you are a facilitator for table three. Patty, you are a facilitator for table two. Sue is your note taker. John Morales, you are a floater. Is there anyone in the room that has a need for Spanish translation? Okay. Do you want to say it in Spanish? I don't think we need it, but if there's a need and you
identify one, please see John. Otherwise, John, I'll have you float around and assist with the tables.

Kim Niemeyer, you are a note taker for table three. Mike Plaziak, you are my time keeper. Kimberly Cox, table one. Pete Pumphrey, table two. Don Jardine, table three. Ian Webster, table one. Raudel Sanchez, table two. Robert Potter, table three. Halil Kavak, table one. Anne Marie Cwieka, table two. Me, I'm facilitating table one right here. My note taker, Rae Bell. Kevin Sullivan, table one. Iain Baker, table two. Margaret Gentile, table three. Matthew Dudley, table one. Stephanie Isaacson, table two. Tracy Egoscue, table three. Chris Maxwell, table one. Mark Krausse, table two. Jose Moreno, table three. Bobby Pena, table one. And I have added Betsy Brunswick, table one. Jim Griffin at table one. Jim Berg, table two. Jessie Ramirez, table three.

And then are there any folks -- please raise your hand if you're not on my list. So can you tell me your name and who you represent?

SUNNY PARKER: Sunny Parker and Hinkley.
GITA KAPAHI: So right now, let's put you at table two.

RICKY PARKER: Ricky Parker; Bible Church. GITA KAPAHI: I'm going to put you at table one.
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| 1 | JESSICA BELLS: Jessica Bells, PG\&E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | GITA KAPAHI: I'm going to put you at table three. |
| 3 | SHARON: Sharon; Hinkley. |
| 4 | GITA KAPAHI: I'll put you at table one. |
| 5 | ROGER KELLIAN: Roger Kellian. I'm a member of the |
| 6 | canyon. |
| 7 | GITA KAPAHI: I'll put you at table two. |
| 8 | Anyone else I did not identify on my master list? |
| 9 | We're two minutes late. Go. No. |
| 10 | So table one, we're going to combine two tables. |
| 11 | Table two, we're going to combine two tables. And |
| 12 | because of noise, I'm going to put table three in the |
| 13 | sagebrush room. |
| 14 | (Break) |
| 15 | GITA KAPAHI: So I think our experiment kind of |
| 16 | worked. There was some great dialogue in the three |
| 17 | tables. I had a chance to finish mine and then go to |
| 18 | another one. It sounded like people were engaged and |
| 19 | enthusiastic, willing to talk, which was great. |
| 20 | We've attempted to summarize some of the themes that |
| 21 | we heard. We heard a lot of great ideas, not |
| 22 | everything -- not all the issues are covered, but we're |
| 23 | highlighting themes that we did hear. There's already |
| 24 | been some edits to some of the language that was used. |
| 25 | And so we hope that we captured most of what was said as |
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accurately as possible. If there are some tweaks, let us know so that we can capture that.

So, first of all, are there any translation needs? Anybody in the audience need Spanish translation? Seeing none. If you do make a comment or wish to speak, please make sure that you speak clearly. We do have a court reporter here that is recording the comments that are made. And please state your name, and we'll make sure that we capture that.

Are there any stragglers out there that I should wait for? So I recognize that some of you were not here this afternoon, that you are -- you're just coming in today now and did not get to participate. So for those of you who weren't here earlier, basically, we went through a new process. It's something we haven't tried before.

I divided the groups into three different tables. Each table had the same set of six questions that were part of the notice for this workshop. And we hoped to talk in the groups to hear any ideas, suggestions, where, what positions people took and why and try to see if there was any commonality, whether there was some middle ground that could potentially be there. What we've done on this one-pager is try to summarize that, what we heard.

WATER BOARD MEETING, MAY 28, 2015

So, for example, for number one, Prescriptive versus Performance, that is kind of tied to number three. So when you look at it, look at the three together. We will e-mail a complete set of the notes that were taken today so that everyone has the chance to see that. And make sure that what we portrayed is accurate to what you said.

We'll also include the technical questions and the responses to those in that e-mail. If you have not already, please leave us your e-mail address so that we can make sure we get that to you. And like I said, we tried to consolidate all the themes from all the tables. So some ideas may seem contradictory to what was at your table. But for the most part, we tried to look for themes there.

There was good disclosure; lots of synergy and interest in having side discussions. We encourage you to do that. Build on the dialogue from today in the coming weeks very, very soon. As we go through each question, think about it. If there are comments or suggestions on the themes, put up your hand and we'll talk about it now. And then later on, we'll talk about next steps and Kim will give us some guidance and some suggested dates for getting comments to us.

So number one was Prescriptive versus Performance.
General favor of performance-based requirements with some
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specific requirements. Prescriptive requirements for sampling, replacement water. Performance-based requirements for remediation. Mapping requirements, there's no specific consensus. How do you build in adaptive management into the requirements? Needs to be protective of water quality. Get the Cleanup and Abatement done in such a way that you don't have to keep coming back to it.

And then I'll go to number three since it's related. Specific deadlines versus remediation goals. Deadlines needed to ensure progress is being made. If not reaching a goal, don't go straight to violation, but instead look at a corrective course of action. Adaptive management with the milestones and measurement of progress.

For number two, the northern and western areas in the USGS study. Continue to watch low levels in the north, focusing on public health and monitoring of domestic wells. And this is where there's been a little bit of editing. If there are hot spots, do something such as pumping, but not necessarily something that would require design and engineering. Don't need to remediate the entire north.

As new information is part of the USGS study or other information is developed incorporated as appropriate as adaptive management.
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FEMALE SPEAKER: I would just clarify that on the point $B$ don't need to remediate the entire -- I think that was --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Meant in the context of prior to the USGS study being completed. I don't think anyone agreed that there was no need for remediation but just -until the study was completed.

GITA KAPAHI: And that's what $I$ heard at our table as well.

Yes, Lisa.
LISA DERNBACH: For group number two, I'm not seeing any of our comments in any of these bullets. We had several "commenters" say "do combination of items," and I'm not seeing any of those combinations recorded.

GITA KAPAHI: And, again, this is the summary of the themes that were common. So two of the three tables may have had more commonality than the third table. Is that -- I mean we --

LISA: And like multiple people at one table had the same comment. Was that discounted because a couple tables ruled it out?

GITA KAPAHI: No.
Kim, do you want to -- I'm sorry. When we -- when we took all of these comments --

KIM COX: Yeah. When we took all of the comments, I
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think that we looked at what was said at each table. The note takers did on occasion note like, "Oh, yes. There were multiple people at the table who said this." So could it be that -- I'm not sure what on number two wasn't -- what was the --

LISA DERNBACH: It was actually number one. Several people said "combination of both performance and prescriptive."

FEMALE SPEAKER: As opposed to the favoring.
(Inaudible due to no microphones.)
SUE GENERA: We're unable to hear people without microphones. So if you want to talk, get a microphone so that we can record it.

LISA DERNBACH: I think that A does reflect that and maybe we can make that more clear. That's what we heard, that for some things, people were saying Prescriptive makes sense. For other things, people were saying that Performance makes -- based makes more sense. But, in general, people were saying, you know, in general, Performance requirements make sense.

LAURIE KEMPER: Not at our table. I was at a different table. And I think there was -- I think what Lisa is trying to say is that there was support for combination of the two. And that's not really -- isn't capturing in this. (Unintelligible.)
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GITA KAPAHI: And at my table as well there was support for combination as well. So perhaps --

KIM COX: But $I$ think that's what $B$ and $C$ are saying is that is a combination of both. We're talking about that there's multiple different kinds.

LAURIE KEMPER: At my table at which you were at, there was a combination. There was a support for combination of both Performance and Prescriptive-based requirements for remediation.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, okay for remediation.
LAURIE KEMPER: So it looks like there was a preference for performance-based for that. Is that my understanding? So any way, I think that the combination is that, yes, general favor, people like the concept of a Performance-based requirement in general. That was sort of the philosophical standpoint. And then as it related to sampling and replacement why there was more of a general favoring -- or understanding of why there would be Prescriptive requirements. But for 1C, there was people on both sides to be able to -- there was also a support for combination remediation.

GITA KAPAHI: And we heard that at our table as well. So perhaps -- this is an exercise that we -- while you were all off for a few hours, we were working through all of the comments from all of the tables trying to come
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up with a summary. And it probably needs tweaking a little bit, but the notes were reflected at what was said at each table. And maybe this can be -- maybe you can take a look at it. Fair enough?

Did I get through three? One and three? So for -and I got through two? So for number four, replacement water. I think there was general consensus to get rid of the term "affected area" in light of a more positive twist on things. Focus on the 10 PPBMCL. In the north, continue to monitor and provide RO as appropriate. For number -- yes?

DARON BANKS: When you say focus on the 10 PPBMCL, what focus on it? In what way? What do you mean? 'Cause that's a general statement also. The Water Board tends to make a lot of general statements that can be led to a lot of interpretation which leads to a lot of leeway on the "discharting." So I mean the 10 PPB really has no discussion in here because it's about the drinking water standards. It's about the whole (unintelligible) replacement. We're not talking about that. We're talking about the remediation. So --

FEMALE SPEAKER: That was the replacement water section.

DARON BANKS: And we still haven't -- there's still a lot of questions to that. Legally, they haven't been
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answered. So I mean, I apologize for stepping ahead, it's not part of that discussion. But $I$ don't feel that the 10 PPB needs to be focused on until the Water Board hears stuff and other legal actions in Sacramento are being done.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Can we have people say who they are?

DARON BANKS: Daron Banks.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
KIM COX: This was just in context of when people would get replacement water. So what we heard was, instead of focusing on the affected area, focus on those affected wells which would be those over ten parks per billion. That was the context of the --

GITA KAPAHI: So for number five, MRP. The counterproposal in the south, all in agreement. This is somewhat shorthand.

Yes, Laurie. Hold on.
LAURIE KEMPRE: I'm Laurie Kemper with the Lahontan Water Board Prosecution team.

Is that the Lahontan Water Board Prosecution team counterproposal in the south? Is that the counterproposal people are in agreement with? I mean that's -- I'm just trying to fill in because it's not real clear.
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| 1 | GITA KAPAHI: It's not really clear. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | LAURIE KEMPRE: But that's what you're talking |
| 3 | about? |
| 4 | GITA KAPAHI: Yes. So continuing. |
| 5 | Not in agreement on the northern monitoring wells |
| 6 | sampling and southern domestic wells frequency. |
| 7 | Prescriptive requirements to transition to |
| 8 | Performance-based requirements based on data and decision |
| 9 | tree. And we heard that at multiple tables. |
| 10 | Yes. Did you -- hang on. Get you a microphone. |
| 11 | BETTY HERNANDEZ: My name is Betty Hernandez. |
| 12 | And on number five, it said "should the monitoring |
| 13 | and report program be Prescriptive, Performance-based, a |
| 14 | Hybrid of Prescriptive, Prescriptions, Performance or |
| 15 | transition into a different approach." |
| 16 | A lot of that I understood is not necessarily |
| 17 | singled out from the north and the south. But what we |
| 18 | were talking about is whether or not a well should be |
| 19 | shut down or not used anymore for sampling after three |
| 20 | quarters or something. It was consistently below, and it |
| 21 | didn't show any way of going up in that well could be |
| 22 | eliminated. And that's what we were arguing about was |
| 23 | the closing of the wells. I think they should just be |
| 24 | put down into an area where they're monitored once a |
| 25 | year, but not shut down. And that's what we were talking |
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about. But I don't see it here, monitoring
(unintelligible) wells sampling. That wasn't what we were talking about. Counterproposal in south, it was in all the wells that are being tested now.

Should they be allowed -- PG\&E allow to shut any one of them down and not use it anymore, which would mean disposing of the well, filling it in completely gone? It would never be able to use it again, and that's what we were talking about at our table.

GITA KAPAHI: So given that there were three tables with three different sets of people at each table, we attempted to summarize what we heard and see where there were some common themes. You know, this is a shorthand version of what we thought. Perhaps it requires a little bit more elaboration. I'm looking to some of the other folks that were in the room. And there may be things that were said at your table that were not common amongst all three tables.

Laurie then Kevin.
LAURIE KEMPRE: This is Laurie.
I think there's been some -- at least at our table, there's been some confusion around Performance-based versus Prescriptive-based. And I know I'm confused about it. And I feel like there is the ability to have a combination, and especially as it relates to what Betty
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is talking about right now and about monitoring is that, in general, there was favor. People understood that there needed to be a Prescription -- or related to sampling. That it's a lot easier to follow a table of wells and frequencies and recognizing that there can be reasons to reduce the frequency from quarterly to annual or to maybe never again if you've got so many years of none text or whatever.

But those things to me sound very Prescriptive. Although, they are also related to Performance. Because as water quality improves and we're achieving our goals, we're seeing Performance; therefore, there's less monitoring.

So in my mind, when I think about this, the monitoring, it's a combination. And people have suggested they want that specificity and triggers. And that's the way $I$ was trying to explain to the folks. You don't have to choose one or the other. It's not adaptive management or Prescriptive. It's not performance or prescriptive. It can, almost in every situation, be a combination.

And I think the public, at least at my table, are interested in seeing the specificity in a lot of situations. Not to say that you can't -- it's not one size fits all. So that part of it -- that's what $I$ think
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is confusing when you just say prescriptive to transition and performance-based requirements. That makes people feel uneasy, because they want to know what else is going to be sampled in the future. They don't want to just go to something that may be sounds fuzzier than that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I don't want the well to be destroyed. That's what we were talking about, the total destruction of the well.

KEVIN SULLIVAN: This is Kevin Sullivan at PG\&E.
And I wanted to address a specific common, because I want to make sure that we're clear on the things that we're looking at going forward in the sampling plan. There are two kinds of wells, monitoring wells and domestic wells.

And I just want to be really clear that although we're suggesting that there be reductions in some monitoring well sampling and through the data and the decision tree, that if the data says we don't need to sample it, maybe anymore, we won't sample it.

But there's no proposal on the table to destroy monitoring wells. We're not there yet. And so we might say, "We don't need to sample this now, but while doctor (unintelligible) is doing his work, while the other things are getting clarified, we're not -- I don't think anyone technically on our -- from the PG\&E side is
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proposing to physically abandon a monitoring level. And we want to save them so that we're sure we know what the goals are. We have every last little $I$ dot and $T$ crossed, and only then would we do it. And I know that's a sensitive enough topic. We want to have a specific discussion about, "Does everybody agree?" I personally think that is three to five years away at the earliest.

When we have talked about abandoning some domestic wells in the past -- and those are wells that were either drilled in the past by homeowners or farmers or whatnot -- they were not specifically designed to monitor. Now, we've used them sometimes to get data. And some of those we have proposed abandoning, because they create a risk of water flow underground. They're not scientifically designed. But even those, we want to be very clear. That's going to be -- in my opinion, separate from the CAO, that's going to be separate question and a separate process. And we'll let each -we're ready to let each one of those stand on their merits. We welcome review by the Water Board, technical staff, by the IRP manager if we decide we don't see the benefit of this well. And the risk of having it outweighs the benefit of any data, we'll put that up. And if there's a consensus, then we'll abandon that. And if not, we're happy to not abandon them until such time.
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So not sampling in our mind is different than abandoning and grabbing a well.

GITA KAPAHI: So for number six, community issues. The complex issues and technical one's needs to be broken down for lay people. Identifying tools and information to demonstrate to realtors, banks, etcetera, what property is safe and not contaminated. The future of Hinkley, rebuild reputation. Cleanup and Abatement in order to provide certainty so that the community can grow. Trust is an issue between the community, the Water Board and PG\&E. IRP manager is doing a good job at this time. And ideas suggested for how the IRP could be the hub of technical and community assistance for the entire community including individuals using many methods of communication and engagement. Those were some of the themes that we heard amongst the tables.

DARON BANKS: On section B -- Daron Banks, sorry.
First of all, that identifying tools and information demonstrated -- there's nobody in here -- at least that that's not their job. And secondly, we don't know what properties are safe because Dr. Bisbicky (phonetic) hasn't told us what properties are safe. It doesn't matter if it's. 02 or 500. If it's PG\&E's contamination, then we don't know that. So you're putting false information if you choose to go that route and go to

Banks and say, "Hey, it's safe." And they have legal issues. They have to identify to people that they're selling to that, you know, "Hey, there's contamination down here." And I know that PG\&E likes to say, "Hey, (unintelligible) fine and safe, but chromium six is chromium six. It's their contamination. So that one -it seems ridiculous to even approach.

And then the -- I think the Water Board and the IRP need to take a step back and look and see what their jobs are in this, please. Their jobs is not to guide open discussions about what a community member would like to do or how they would like to pursue something in the future of the community.
'Cause there's very few people that actually -there's probably four or five people in this entire room that live in the community, but there's a large majority of people in this room that saw this community just four years ago. And if you take a mental picture of what that looked like four years ago to what it looks like now, you know, the picture that you see is infinitely different from what we see. We live there. We know what's been done to our community.

So the Water Board has attempted in the past to kind of interject or help out community members to do things for the community and kind of ended up looking foolish,

WATER BOARD MEETING, MAY 28, 2015
you know, specifically the mess with Mr. White. I mean it was -- they shouldn't have been involved in helping them write the paper to do the work to help get it going, and it was -- even your own staff brought people to our community to say, "This isn't plausible, but yet you supported it."

So I think that you guys need to look and see what your job is. Your job is to ensure that $P G \& E$ cleans up their chromium six and makes our water whole like it was before, and that's it. That's it.

GITA KAPAHI: So that's a summary of the six issues that were discussed earlier today. I think -- now, as I mentioned, there were some synergism that happened. There were some conversations where it sounded like some folks were close on some issues. That maybe with a little bit of dialogue, maybe there could be some common ground. And we encourage those conversations.

Kim, did you want to talk about the next steps? And then we'll go to Pete for some other comments.

KIM COX: So for our next steps, we're going to take what we heard today, what we heard in the comments that the -- the written comments that we received, the responses that were received, the additional information that was received that we requested that had the questions on, and we're going to revise the order based
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on all that information. That is going to go out at the end of July.

And so then, again, what Gita was saying in terms of if you have these conversations and have ideas -unfortunately, you can't have them with us directly because that's called ex parte communication. But what you can do is if you have thoughts and ideas of points of consensus that you come up with, you can forward those to us, but you have to forward it to everyone else too.

And we are open to language, to ideas, but we need those by June 19th. Because we're going to be, in the meantime, revising the order and giving everyone an opportunity to comment on all those revisions.

So what we're asking for on June 19th is not comments on the order or anything else; those are just points of consensus. There will be another opportunity to comment on the revised order, and that's going to be, I think, 45 days after. That goes out at the end of July. And then our hope is to then have the board meeting in September at which this item will be heard and then hopefully have a final order for you.

I think that's it in terms of the process. If anyone has any questions --

GITA KAPAHI: And if you have any other thoughts, comments or suggestions or ideas on how to further some
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of what we heard today, I'm opening it up to comment now. LAURIE KEMPER: Will you please clarify the "us's" again, because a lot of people may not understand what you meant? And then on to that in terms of the discussion, the notion that any group or subgroup -- I mean prosecution team, PG\&E could get together, you know, just to explain all of that because that was not real clear.

KIM COX: Sure. It was not real clear. Thank you, Laurie. And, yeah, 'cause a lot of times, I deal with this so much, I kind of assume that everybody knows what I'm talk about just as you guys probably have things that are like that for you.

So the board members, all of the board members, even those that are not here, Patty, myself, Doug Smith and Rich Booth, we are all part -- well, the board members -and then we are part of the advisory team, Patty, Doug, Rich and I. So we can not have communications with anyone on this order unless it's part of -- open to everybody, so something like this. Or an e-mail that comes to us and includes PG\&E and the prosecution team, which is Laurie Kemper and Ann Holden and Lisa Dernbach and AnnaCatherine Benedict. So it has to -- and then PG\&E, of course, is the subject of this order.

And so PG\&E and the prosecution team and the public,
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you all can have conversations together. And you guys can talk about this all you want. But it just can't include the board members or the members of the advisory team unless everybody is included in that conversation.

Does that make sense or is that still confusing?
Laurie, do you want to help me out with what I'm missing.

LAURIE KEMPER: I think $I$ can pretty much explain that, I think, maybe short circles. But the point being that Kevin and I could meet, and we could talk about some solutions. You know, we can say, "We're really close on the monitoring." You think if we just met and came up with the plan, we could submit that to the group. And I think the best way to submit it to the group is not have everybody's e-mails, addresses, but if we use the Water Board's enforcement e-mail address.

KIM COX: Which is on the --
LAURIE KEMPER: Flyer.
KIM COX: -- request for comments.
LAURIE KEMPER: Then that goes to Sue, our executive assistant, who would then --

SUE: I have everyone's e-mail address, and I send it out.

LAURIE KEMPER: So then she'd send it out to everybody, so everybody would know that Kevin and I had
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an idea that we wanted the advisory team to think about, you know, maybe it's a section of the proposed cleanup order that we revised or edit or something like that.

So the same thing can happen between Penny Harper and Daron Banks or Penny Harper and me. And so it's -when Kim says we can all talk to each other, I mean that was the confusing part, because that's what we're doing today. We're all talking to each other and they're here, and that's the way it goes. But the point is that it's okay for these individual or sidebar conversations with anybody here in the room, you know, separate from the advisory team.

So that's -- I think when you guys said something about -- we're encouraging you all to talk more -- I mean I think we really are saying we're looking for ideas and solutions and any suggestive changes or language that then -- as long as you've just identified where that came from and who was in support of that idea, that gives the advisory team some additional information when they craft a new revised order. That will also go out for everybody for public comment.

KIM COX: And just to finish the process part -- so all these ideas will come to the Board in that new, revised draft. But the Board may or may not vote in favor of it. Not all the Board is here. Again, we said
earlier, the people here couldn't make any promises on behalf of the Board. So just understand that even though you guys all may think it's a good idea and everyone agrees, that doesn't necessarily make it so. Although, it makes it really likely if everybody is in favor of it.

DARON BANKS: In the spirit of the last
conversation, that $I$ want to request a formal request that your technical exchange meetings, I guess, are what they're called. At one point, we're promised to be on the phone just to listen, and then we requested a detail of the conversation. And this has been well over a year I think. It's been about a year and a half. At one time -- in that time period, we've received one response from that, and it was an outline. It was -- we talked about this, this and this. So it told us (unintelligible) discussion.

And so if that statement is true, we would like a detail of what you and PG\&E discussed in Lake Tahoe during your technical exchange meetings, whether audio, video or somebody typing it out of what everybody says so that we may read it and discuss at our meetings.

KIM COX: So the ex parte rules only apply to pending matters. So we do not discuss the Cleanup and Abatement Order at all during those meetings.

DARON BANKS: There's been orders directly from
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those meetings and letters written directly from those meetings. So actions have been taken directly from those meetings. So that's not a true statement. It's very true.

KIM COX: Well, no. The Cleanup and Abatement Order is what's been pending. So things may come out of those discussions, but there's nothing pending before the Board at the time.

DARON BANKS: But when you change an order from a letter that comes from that, I mean the community should know about it. And we were promised that we would get those detailed conversations by the executive officer.

KIM COX: I don't know.
Patty, you want to -- and --
DARON BANKS: And there's probably five people here that heard the promise.

PATTY KOUYOUMDJIAN: This is Patty Kouyoumdjian.
And Daron, we've discussed this, I know numerous (unintelligible) written letters to the CAC about this as well. We do have technical meetings with PG\&E, and we do not discuss things that require action. It is truly a technical meeting. And we do have minutes, and that's what we agreed to in the letter $I$ send. And every time we have a meeting, it's sent to Ian. And it's my understanding that gets disseminated. So we do -- we
have fall through with what we said we would do at those meetings.

FEMALE SPEAKER: The minutes have been sent to us through Ann?

PATTY KOUYOUMDJIAN: Yes.
DARON BANKS: I'll give you an example. PG\&E brought water flow maps. And from those water flow maps, you make determinations on boundaries and borders of the plum. So actions were taken directly from those meetings. Your staff told me that that was discussed. And the letters came directly from those meetings.

PATTY KOUYOUMDJIAN: We do have technical
discussions, and we do this with other dischargers and other things on a regular basis. And we traditionally do not have those open to the public. This is when we take an extra step by writing up the minutes and sharing with each. That's in the letter that $I$ sent previously.

KIM COX: Are there any other questions?
ANNACATHERINE BENEDICT: This is Annacatherine Benedict.

So I was just wondering, are we going to have hearing procedures issued before the September hearing then?

KIM COX: Yes. Before the September hearing, we'll -- I think at the -- when we issue the July draft,
that will have some sort of procedures that will come out of that too.

ANNACATHERINE BENEDICT: Okay. Just wanted to make sure. And then the June 19th, it's finally end of day, you'd want all written -- 5 o'clock; right?

KIM COX: Yeah.
ANNACATHERINE BENEDICT: Just wanted to make sure. Okay. Thank you.

KIM COX: And, again, that June 19th is not another comment period on the drafts. It's just for --

ANNACATHERINE BENEDICT: Consensus only; right?
KIM COX: Right.
ANNACATHERINE BENEDICT: I got it. No more comments.

KEVIN SULLIVAN: Yeah. This is Kevin Sullivan from PG\&E.

We kind of have three procedural questions that I'd just -- I'd like to kind of get the advisory teams thoughts while we're all together. So thanks for the June 19th heads up. We're heading into sometimes of summer holidays and whatnot.

So number one, how it -- if there's consensus developing on June 20th, can you just help me understand a little bit about the need for deadline and why that is?

And number two, are there particular areas that you
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guys -- that the advisory team -- from what you heard today, I'm taking this that you're essentially saying -we think you might be close and maybe you could get language that we would be inclined to adopt. I'm wondering if you could -- we covered a lot of ground today, and we all heard a little bit of different things.

I'm wondering if you might have any thoughts or suggestions as to where you thought those -- "Why don't you guys get together and try to line a section on blah," right?

And then $I$ guess my last kind of observation and question is that crafting an order like this is really hard. And I want to actually thank the prosecution team for making a first shock that we've all been looking at for the last few months. It's hard to get on paper the the concepts that we talked about and then understand all the unintended consequences of words that are written on the page. That's what reviews are for.

And I'm wondering after the advisory team's draft comes out at the end of July, are there any thoughts -- I mean we talked about sort of an implementation session where we just have a dialogue like this that says things like, "Okay. You wrote section one, two and three." I'm reading that to mean dada, dada, da. And, again, not so much heavy edits, but just sort of a feedback. But the
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words on this page seem to be to communicate $x, y$ or $z$. So I'm just wondering if you've given any thought to a post July process. And if there's a formal process or at that point are just straight written letters.

KIM COX: So for the first question in terms of the deadline, it's not a hard deadline, but we are trying to get something out by the end of July in order to have a comment -- a meaningful comment period and have a September board meeting.

So I don't think that we would shut down something that was well thought out and brought to us. And if it made sense, then I don't think that we would shut something out. But we're trying to meet deadlines too. So if it was past that deadline, then it would be harder for us to, perhaps, consider it.

But -- and if you want to give us a heads up, that would be helpful. Maybe an e-mail that said, "Hey, we feel like we're getting close on this issue." In terms of what issues parties seem close on, maybe I'll let some of the other facilitators talk. But it seemed to me that the northern and western areas, that was something that seemed kind of a lot closer to me than $I$ thought the parties were.

And then also the MRP, the monitoring reporting program, it sounded like there were some parts that
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were -- everyone was in agreement in. And I don't know, Doug, did you want to --

DOUG SMITH: Sure. I'll add something there. There was an area that $I$ thought $I$ sensed willingness to have further talk amongst the parties and was dealing with the adaptive management and what that means, especially with the remediation goals to try to just kind of further talk about that as part of -- and figuring out what the deadlines mean.

KIM COX: And then -- I'm sorry. Remind me of the last question.

KEVIN SULLIVAN: The post.
KIM COX: Oh, the post. I think our thought was we would just have a comment period again on those changes and then the final order. I think the Board -- I won't speak for them, but has been open to -- you know, if things are moving along, if there seems to be coming together on ideas, September is not a hard line in the sand necessarily, but we do want to move things along so that we can all have a Cleanup and Abatement Order in place and get stuff going.

PATTY KOUYOUMDJIAN: This is Patty. If I can add one more.

I also saw a lot of consensus on the role of independent technical advisory for the community that
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there seemed to be a lot of themes for what that role would look like.

KIM COX: And I guess maybe, too, another time for the implementation might be even after the order is adopted. You know, there might be a time period of sitting down and talking down about what that means. But beforehand is probably a good idea too.

GITA KAPAHI: Any other questions, comments, thoughts?

Patty?
PATTY KOUYOUMDJIAN: Yeah. We just encourage you to open up the floor not. So these are just some of the themes, of course, clearly not all of them. But if you have any comments, suggestions, ideas here or otherwise -- because we heard some other ideas that are not here, we want to open up the floor to have people talk about some of these if you want to. The musical chairs is why it was exhausting. We know.

GITA KAPAHI: Some closing comments.
Pete, would you like to say anything?
PETE: Well, here is a surprise -- first of all, I'd like to say that I'm really in awe of the board members, Jardine's ability to fly below the radar. And $I$ need to pay attention to how he does that.

As Ms. Niemeyer pointed out -- and I'm glad she did
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-- you all need to understand that there were no decisions made here today. There's not going to be any decisions made by anybody except by the Board when the Board hears the proposed order, whenever it is. Hopefully, it's in September. But it's a decision that is made by the forum of the Board. And that's why as individual board members, we were here individually because we don't represent the Board today.

I think I can say that the Board is grateful for everybody who took the time and continues to take the time. It sounds like they're willing to take the time some more to talk about these issues and to see if they could come to a meeting of the minds of at least some aspect of what we're talking about.

I feel very confident that everyone on the Board really, truly appreciates the energy that you've put into this. And I'm very encouraged when I got here earlier this evening and was sort of wandering around, I heard over and over again, maybe four, five, six times, people used the phrase, "The gap wasn't as large as I thought it was. They weren't as far apart as I though they might be." And I find that incredibly encouraging.

I really want to thank Gita for putting together a format that allowed us to come to that realization this afternoon and this evening. It's a tremendous
achievement, and she did a really wonderful job along with the facilitators and note takers. So thank you.

Thank you all. God speed. Keep at it. We're getting closer, and this is a really great way, I think, to come to a consensus about how we're supposed to go forward. Because it allows us to bring it all together as opposed to, "Okay. Here it is. Deal with it." And so I look forward to seeing the products of your continued conversations.

Thanks very, very much.
GITA KAPAHI: So unless there's any other comments, I thank you all for your participation today.

Did you want to say something?
JON: Allergic to this?
Thank you, Pete.
SUE: Can you put it closer to your mouth so we can hear?

JON: Thank you, Pete. I think we are --
SUE: Jon, can you speak up a lot louder? The court reporter cannot hear you.

JON: Thank you. I think this is -- we are a lot closer than $I$ suspected when $I$ first walked in. And I think everyone, at least at our table, were very forward, were very productive. And I think -- I'm just looking forward to some constructive dialogue in the near future.
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I thank you all.
Kim?
Thank you all.
GITA KAPAHI: Thank you. Yes, Ian.
IAN WEBSTER: So as the assigned -- currently assigned by IRP manager, I also reflect and applaud their remarks. And I think there is a -- coming to these meetings, I always look for the degree of tension, the degree of (unintelligible). And the (unintelligible) towards the end of the tunnel here.

In my role and the team of the IRP managers in support of the community, you know, it was a very definite scope at the beginning when we were brought on, which was kind of technical issues. And for those of you who have been through the roughly 30 community meetings, we've talked at -- we've held over 200 individual meetings.

And we've talked to 64 in the community over and over again in their homes. The topics of naturally early on have been focused on the technical aspects of the mission if $I$ were to retain such as plum definition. (Unintelligible) and measure and analyze chromium ground water. What's this finger? What's hydraulic control? What's the Thompson road barrier? How does the IRP work? What does (unintelligible) do? I could go on and on and

WATER BOARD MEETING, MAY 28, 2015
on.

But in the past three years as things have evolved, there is and (unintelligible) to be within the (unintelligible) about technical issues. But the migration of, I think, towards things associated with the future. And the future has been mentioned in the handout tonight.

So I think one of the things that the folks who were (unintelligible) this project along in the interface between the -- as PG\&E and the Water Board interacted towards technical issues, the IRP function -- I use the word "IRP function," has been strongly asked to given proof on the future of Hinkley. How does the remedy that it's going to be here for a long, long time? How does that interact with the future of the community, such as farming issues, water management? We are (unintelligible) going the real estate market is going to be interested in the future here?

So I think one of the things that are recognized as the IRP manager (unintelligible) to technical resource. But from my position, I think some flexibility needs to be given to the IRP functionality. (Unintelligible) go to offer advice to the community on some of these topics just mentioned that are not hard technical topics but are softer and more towards the aspects of living in Hinkley
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in the long-term future. So my conclusionary remark and my --

BETTY: I don't know who's going to help with this or how it's going to get solved, but we can't have a future in Hinkley. There is no future in Hinkley if we can't get across to the public that we are not contaminated, that "our water isn't going to kill anybody, that "we live in a really nice area, and our water is okay. And our water isn't this and our water isn't that."

Nobody wants to live out here because they start drinking the water and their family is going to kill over. And we can't do anything if we don't have some help and support from the Water Board and from PG\&E to get this message across.

So that for those of us that are left behind, that are happy to stay in Hinkley and want to stay in Hinkley can stay in Hinkley. And we can conduct our business like normal people. That if we want to sell our house, we can sell it without every mortgage person telling, "No. We're not interested in you. We're not interested in handling this. No. No." That's all I get when I call. I've been trying to get a reverse mortgage. Well, if it's not possible, nobody wants (unintelligible). I was living in Barstow, but ten miles away from Barstow
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and Barstow water is coming from 300 feet from my house, but $I$ can't. I still can't get them to understand that I have good water. I have fine water. I don't have anything wrong with my water. My water is fine. It's been tested and tested and tested. It's good.

But I need some help, because I am obviously not big enough to do this by myself. And $I$ know I'm not the only person that's facing this problem. And we need some help.

GITA KAPAHI: Anybody else wish to say anything?

So I want to reiterate that there -- we've posted somewhere -- oh, at the very bottom is the e-mail address where your comments need to go by June 19 th and by close of business, June 19th, so that they can get distributed to everybody.

I thank you all for your participation all day today. Give yourselves a round of applause, a job well-done, and thank you. Until next time.
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