

# Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMPREHENSIVE CHROMIUM-CONTAMINATED GROUNDWATER CLEANUP STRATEGY, FROM PG&E's HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION *Public Questionnaire*



1. Do you plan to read the Draft EIR?  
(check one)
- Yes, most or all
  - Yes, only the Summary or Fact Sheet
  - Maybe
  - No

2. Would you rather the chromium-contamination **cleanup time** be (choose one):
- a. As quick as possible regardless of the environmental impacts (lower water table, byproducts created, chromium left in aquifer, habitat loss, etc, with most offset by mitigation measures).
  - b. Equally balanced between speed and environmental impacts.
  - c. Take as long as necessary to avoid most or all environmental impacts.
  - d. Not sure.
  - e. Don't care.

3. Which cleanup option in the Draft EIR affecting the entire plume do you prefer (rank 1 for most favorite and 6 for least favorite—see handouts). *Require them to cleanup to levels before discharge*

- 6 a. **No Project**—only activities occurring today to be continued in future (in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source (Compressor Station) plus 3 agricultural (ag) fields for lower chromium levels to the north—one crop)—yields longest cleanup time of >1,000 years.
- 3 b. **4B**—same as No Project but with 6 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop)—yields cleanup time of 40 years to ~~3.1~~ ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- 2 c. **4C-2**—same as No Project but with ~~10~~ ag fields operating year round (two crops) — yields cleanup time of 39 years to ~~3.1~~ ppb Cr[VI] and 90 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI]. *to their discharge*
- 5 d. **4C-3**—in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop) plus an above-ground treatment facility to remove chromium from groundwater in north during winter months and disposal of chromium elsewhere—yields cleanup time of 36 years to ~~3.1~~ ppb Cr[VI] and 85 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI]. *prior to their plume levels*
- 4 e. **4C-4**— same as No Project but with 26 ag fields operating year round (two crops)—yields fastest cleanup time of 29 years to ~~3.1~~ ppb Cr[VI] and 75 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- 1 f. **4C-5**—an above-ground treatment facility at and near source to remove chromium from groundwater and disposal of chromium elsewhere plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months

per year (one crop) for lower chromium levels to the north-- yields second slowest cleanup time of 50 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].

4. Check the environmental impact(s) are you willing to accept as part of the final chromium cleanup strategy.

- I guess if it had to be done*
- a. Some temporary lowering of water table, to be restored in future.
  - b. Lots of lowering of water table with possible permanent aquifer compaction and land subsidence, and changes in water chemistry (arsenic or uranium) in wells. Mitigation to be provided: alternate water supply, and water table and water quality restored in future<sup>1</sup>—water yield likely not restored if compaction occurs.
  - c. Loss of use of domestic well for indoor use and given alternate water supply; domestic well can still be used for outdoor uses, such as landscaping. Mitigation would be alternate water supply, with water table restored in future.
  - d. Loss of endangered desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel habitat in the project area, with possible land swap elsewhere for habitat.
  - e. Some temporary byproducts in aquifer (manganese, iron, arsenic) due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future.
  - f. Lots of temporary byproducts (manganese, iron, arsenic) to groundwater due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future. Mitigation until aquifer is restored will be monitoring and possible alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
  - g. Some temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase in groundwater from additional agricultural fields, with water quality to be restored in future.
  - h. Lots of temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase affecting groundwater quality from many additional agricultural fields. Mitigation will be to provide alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
  - i. Leaving chromium in the aquifer at the source area as solid Cr(III) (trivalent<sup>2</sup>).
  - j. Leaving chromium in the soil at the agricultural unit areas as solid Cr(III) (trivalent).

*These are things that no one would be willing to except if given a choice*

<sup>1</sup> depending on the alternative – would be from 30-100 years.

<sup>2</sup> Cr(VI) hexavalent chromium is the toxic form of chromium. Cr(III) trivalent chromium has very low toxicity.





Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
COMPREHENSIVE CHROMIUM-CONTAMINATED  
GROUNDWATER CLEANUP STRATEGY,  
FROM PG&E's HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION

Public Questionnaire



1. Do you plan to read the Draft EIR? (check one)
- Yes, most or all
  - Yes, only the Summary or Fact Sheet
  - Maybe  No
2. Would you rather the chromium-contamination **cleanup time** be (choose one):
- a. As quick as possible regardless of the environmental impacts (lower water table, byproducts created, chromium left in aquifer, habitat loss, etc, with most offset by mitigation measures).
  - b. Equally balanced between speed and environmental impacts.
  - c. Take as long as necessary to avoid most or all environmental impacts.
  - d. Not sure.
  - e. Don't care.
3. Which cleanup option in the Draft EIR affecting the entire plume do you prefer (rank 1 for most favorite and 6 for least favorite—see handouts).
- 6 a. **No Project**—only activities occurring today to be continued in future (in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source (Compressor Station) plus 3 agricultural (ag) fields for lower chromium levels to the north--one crop)—yields longest cleanup time of >1,000 years.
  - 2 b. **4B**—same as No Project but with 6 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop)—yields cleanup time of 40 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - 3 c. **4C-2**—same as No Project but with 10 ag fields operating year round (two crops) --- yields cleanup time of 39 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 90 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - 1 d. **4C-3**—in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop) plus an above-ground treatment facility to remove chromium from groundwater in north during winter months and disposal of chromium elsewhere—yields cleanup time of 36 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 85 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - 4 e. **4C-4**— same as No Project but with 26 ag fields operating year round (two crops)—yields fastest cleanup time of 29 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 75 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - 5 f. **4C-5**—an above-ground treatment facility at and near source to remove chromium from groundwater and disposal of chromium elsewhere plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months

per year (one crop) for lower chromium levels to the north-- yields second slowest cleanup time of 50 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].

4. Check the environmental impact(s) are you willing to accept as part of the final chromium cleanup strategy.

- a. Some temporary lowering of water table, to be restored in future.
- b. Lots of lowering of water table with possible permanent aquifer compaction and land subsidence, and changes in water chemistry (arsenic or uranium) in wells. Mitigation to be provided: alternate water supply, and water table and water quality restored in future<sup>1</sup>—water yield likely not restored if compaction occurs.
- c. Loss of use of domestic well for indoor use and given alternate water supply; domestic well can still be used for outdoor uses, such as landscaping. Mitigation would be alternate water supply, with water table restored in future.
- d. Loss of endangered desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel habitat in the project area, with possible land swap elsewhere for habitat.
- e. Some temporary byproducts in aquifer (manganese, iron, arsenic) due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future.
- f. Lots of temporary byproducts (manganese, iron, arsenic) to groundwater due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future. Mitigation until aquifer is restored will be monitoring and possible alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- g. Some temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase in groundwater from additional agricultural fields, with water quality to be restored in future.
- h. Lots of temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase affecting groundwater quality from many additional agricultural fields. Mitigation will be to provide alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- i. Leaving chromium in the aquifer at the source area as solid Cr(III) (trivalent<sup>2</sup>).
- j. Leaving chromium in the soil at the agricultural unit areas as solid Cr(III) (trivalent).

<sup>1</sup> depending on the alternative – would be from 30-100 years.

<sup>2</sup> Cr(VI) hexavalent chromium is the toxic form of chromium. Cr(III) trivalent chromium has very low toxicity.

Provide other comments:

LIFT OR CANCEL ALL DEAD LINES GIVEN BY PG&E. WE THE PEOPLE OF HINKLEY SHOULD MAKE DEAD LINES TO PG&E FOR CLEAN UP. ALL PROPERTY OWNERS SHOULD BE GIVEN ALL 3 OPTIONS OFFERED BY PG&E WITH NO TIME LIMITS. PG&E SHOULD HAVE TO: 1. DIG DEEPER WELL 2. INSTALL FILTRATION SYSTEM (WITHOUT 5 YR LIMIT) 3. PROPERTY PURCHASE PROGRAM LEFT OPEN (NO TIME LIMIT) UNTIL HOUSING MARKET COMES UP SO WE CAN SELL PROPERTY WITHOUT TAKING A LOSS. PG&E HAS BEEN DRAGGING THEIR FEET FOR OVER 24 YEARS WITH THIS PROBLEM. I UNDERSTAND THAT PG&E IS A BIG COMPANY WITH BIG MONEY SUPPORTERS AND THINK THEY ARE BEYOND THE LAW. THEY HAVE BEEN MAKING THE RULES ALL ALONG. THIS HAS TO STOP. THE HOUSING MARKET IS IN DECLINE, WE WANT TO SELL OUR PROPERTY AND MOVE. PG&E ARE THE ONLY PEOPLE WE CAN SELL TO. WE HAVE PRICED PROPERTIES WITH 5 ACRES AND SAME SIZE HOUSE FOR \$179,000.00 AND UP, PG&E ONLY OFFERED US \$119,000.00 HOW CAN WE GET OUT OF HERE?!!!

ALAN J. FLETCHER

36566 Flower ROAD

Name (optional)

Address (optional)

ALL COMMENTS ARE DUE TO THE WATER BOARD BY OCTOBER 19, 2012.

For questions, contact Anne Holden at (530) 542-5450 or [aholden@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:aholden@waterboards.ca.gov).

Fax No. (530) 544-2271

96150770401



Fold line

 **Mr & Mrs Alan J Fletcher**  
 36566 Flower Rd.  
 Hinkley, CA 92347-9633

SAN DIEGO CA 92101

06 OCT 2012 PM 10:11



TO:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
 Lahontan Region  
 2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

(staple or tape closed)

# Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMPREHENSIVE CHROMIUM-CONTAMINATED GROUNDWATER CLEANUP STRATEGY, FROM PG&E's HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION

### Public Questionnaire



1. Do you plan to read the Draft EIR? (check one)  
 Yes, most or all  
 Yes, only the Summary or Fact Sheet  
 Maybe  No
  
2. Would you rather the chromium-contamination **cleanup time** be (choose one):  
 a. As quick as possible regardless of the environmental impacts (lower water table, byproducts created, chromium left in aquifer, habitat loss, etc, with most offset by mitigation measures).  
 b. Equally balanced between speed and environmental impacts.  
 c. Take as long as necessary to avoid most or all environmental impacts.  
 d. Not sure.  
 e. Don't care.
  
3. Which cleanup option in the Draft EIR affecting the entire plume do you prefer (rank 1 for most favorite and 6 for least favorite—see handouts).
  - \_\_\_\_\_ a. **No Project**—only activities occurring today to be continued in future (in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source (Compressor Station) plus 3 agricultural (ag) fields for lower chromium levels to the north--one crop)—yields longest cleanup time of >1,000 years.
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. **4B**—same as No Project but with 6 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop)—yields cleanup time of 40 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. **4C-2**—same as No Project but with 10 ag fields operating year round (two crops) --- yields cleanup time of 39 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 90 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. **4C-3**—in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop) plus an above-ground treatment facility to remove chromium from groundwater in north during winter months and disposal of chromium elsewhere—yields cleanup time of 36 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 85 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - \_\_\_\_\_ e. **4C-4**— same as No Project but with 26 ag fields operating year round (two crops)—yields fastest cleanup time of 29 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 75 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
  - \_\_\_\_\_ f. **4C-5**—an above-ground treatment facility at and near source to remove chromium from groundwater and disposal of chromium elsewhere plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months

per year (one crop) for lower chromium levels to the north-- yields second slowest cleanup time of 50 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].

4. Check the environmental impact(s) are you willing to accept as part of the final chromium cleanup strategy.

- a. Some temporary lowering of water table, to be restored in future.
- b. Lots of lowering of water table with possible permanent aquifer compaction and land subsidence, and changes in water chemistry (arsenic or uranium) in wells. Mitigation to be provided: alternate water supply, and water table and water quality restored in future<sup>1</sup>—water yield likely not restored if compaction occurs.
- c. Loss of use of domestic well for indoor use and given alternate water supply; domestic well can still be used for outdoor uses, such as landscaping. Mitigation would be alternate water supply, with water table restored in future.
- d. Loss of endangered desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel habitat in the project area, with possible land swap elsewhere for habitat.
- e. Some temporary byproducts in aquifer (manganese, iron, arsenic) due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future.
- f. Lots of temporary byproducts (manganese, iron, arsenic) to groundwater due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future. Mitigation until aquifer is restored will be monitoring and possible alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- g. Some temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase in groundwater from additional agricultural fields, with water quality to be restored in future.
- h. Lots of temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase affecting groundwater quality from many additional agricultural fields. Mitigation will be to provide alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- i. Leaving chromium in the aquifer at the source area as solid Cr(III) (trivalent<sup>2</sup>).
- j. Leaving chromium in the soil at the agricultural unit areas as solid Cr(III) (trivalent).

<sup>1</sup> depending on the alternative – would be from 30-100 years.

<sup>2</sup> Cr(VI) hexavalent chromium is the toxic form of chromium. Cr(III) trivalent chromium has very low toxicity.

Provide other comments:

This is a big joke.

P.G. & E. should have been made to clean us up long ago, sparing no cost to them.

P.G. & E. should have been made to pay for the water treatment systems (maintenance) in perpetuity instead of ruining lives and destroying a community.

Name (optional)

Address (optional)

**ALL COMMENTS ARE DUE TO THE WATER BOARD BY OCTOBER 19, 2012.**

For questions, contact Anne Holden at (530) 542-5450 or [aholden@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:aholden@waterboards.ca.gov).

Fax No. (530) 544-2271

(staple or tape closed)

South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.

Lahontan Region

California Regional Water Quality Control Board,

TO:



TO OCT 2012 PM 51

SN BERNARDINO CA 923

Fold line

# Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMPREHENSIVE CHROMIUM-CONTAMINATED GROUNDWATER CLEANUP STRATEGY, FROM PG&E's HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION *Public Questionnaire*

1. Do you plan to read the Draft EIR? (check one)
- Yes, most or all  
 Yes, only the Summary or Fact Sheet  
 Maybe  No
2. Would you rather the chromium-contamination **cleanup time** be (choose one):
- a. As quick as possible regardless of the environmental impacts (lower water table, byproducts created, chromium left in aquifer, habitat loss, etc, with most offset by mitigation measures).
- b. Equally balanced between speed and environmental impacts.
- c. Take as long as necessary to avoid most or all environmental impacts.
- d. Not sure.
- e. Don't care.
3. Which cleanup option in the Draft EIR affecting the entire plume do you prefer (rank 1 for most favorite and 6 for least favorite—see handouts).
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. **No Project**—only activities occurring today to be continued in future (in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source (Compressor Station) plus 3 agricultural (ag) fields for lower chromium levels to the north—one crop)—yields longest cleanup time of >1,000 years.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. **4B**—same as No Project but with 6 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop)—yields cleanup time of 40 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. **4C-2**—same as No Project but with 10 ag fields operating year round (two crops) —yields cleanup time of 39 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 90 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- d. **4C-3**—in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop) plus an above-ground treatment facility to remove chromium from groundwater in north during winter months and disposal of chromium elsewhere—yields cleanup time of 36 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 85 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. **4C-4**— same as No Project but with 26 ag fields operating year round (two crops)—yields fastest cleanup time of 29 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 75 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. **4C-5**—an above-ground treatment facility at and near source to remove chromium from groundwater and disposal of chromium elsewhere plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months

per year (one crop) for lower chromium levels to the north-- yields second slowest cleanup time of 50 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].

4. Check the environmental impact(s) are you willing to accept as part of the final chromium cleanup strategy.

- a. Some temporary lowering of water table, to be restored in future.
- b. Lots of lowering of water table with possible permanent aquifer compaction and land subsidence, and changes in water chemistry (arsenic or uranium) in wells. Mitigation to be provided: alternate water supply, and water table and water quality restored in future<sup>1</sup>—water yield likely not restored if compaction occurs.
- c. Loss of use of domestic well for indoor use and given alternate water supply; domestic well can still be used for outdoor uses, such as landscaping. Mitigation would be alternate water supply, with water table restored in future.
- d. Loss of endangered desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel habitat in the project area, with possible land swap elsewhere for habitat.
- e. Some temporary byproducts in aquifer (manganese, iron, arsenic) due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future.
- f. Lots of temporary byproducts (manganese, iron, arsenic) to groundwater due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future. Mitigation until aquifer is restored will be monitoring and possible alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- g. Some temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase in groundwater from additional agricultural fields, with water quality to be restored in future.
- h. Lots of temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase affecting groundwater quality from many additional agricultural fields. Mitigation will be to provide alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- i. Leaving chromium in the aquifer at the source area as solid Cr(III) (trivalent<sup>2</sup>).
- j. Leaving chromium in the soil at the agricultural unit areas as solid Cr(III) (trivalent).

<sup>1</sup> depending on the alternative – would be from 30-100 years.

<sup>2</sup> Cr(VI) hexavalent chromium is the toxic form of chromium. Cr(III) trivalent chromium has very low toxicity.

Provide other comments:

I would just like th water restored,  
and with out hurting the environment while  
doing it. I don't want, and don't like the Subsidence  
that is in the water now beside having Ctb,  
in our water with the cleanup Hinkley has black water,  
arsenic or uranium and mangenese, iron.  
What ever is necessary to clean this up.

Geri Simpson

23535 Comm Blvd.

Name (optional)

Address (optional)

**ALL COMMENTS ARE DUE TO THE WATER BOARD BY OCTOBER 19, 2012.**

For questions, contact Anne Holden at (530) 542-5450 or [aholden@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:aholden@waterboards.ca.gov).

Fax No. (530) 544-2271

Fold line

---

*Place  
stamp  
here*

TO:

California Regional Water Quality Control Board,  
Lahontan Region  
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

(staple or tape closed)

# Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMPREHENSIVE CHROMIUM-CONTAMINATED GROUNDWATER CLEANUP STRATEGY, FROM PG&E's HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION *Public Questionnaire*

1. Do you plan to read the Draft EIR? (check one)
- Yes, most or all  
 Yes, only the Summary or Fact Sheet  
 Maybe  No

2. Would you rather the chromium-contamination cleanup time be (choose one):
- a. As quick as possible regardless of the environmental impacts (lower water table, byproducts created, chromium left in aquifer, habitat loss, etc, with most offset by mitigation measures).
- b. Equally balanced between speed and environmental impacts.
- c. Take as long as necessary to avoid most or all environmental impacts.
- d. Not sure.
- e. Don't care.

F.  *Water Removed from Ground. Cleaned. Returned to Ground*

3. Which cleanup option in the Draft EIR affecting the entire plume do you prefer (rank 1 for most favorite and 6 for least favorite—see handouts).

- None*
- a. **No Project**—only activities occurring today to be continued in future (in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source (Compressor Station) plus 3 agricultural (ag) fields for lower chromium levels to the north—one crop)—yields longest cleanup time of >1,000 years.
- b. **4B**—same as No Project but with 6 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop)—yields cleanup time of 40 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- c. **4C-2**—same as No Project but with 10 ag fields operating year round (two crops) — yields cleanup time of 39 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 90 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- d. **4C-3**—in-situ treatment for chromium at and near source plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months per year (one crop) plus an above-ground treatment facility to remove chromium from groundwater in north during winter months and disposal of chromium elsewhere—yields cleanup time of 36 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 85 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- 2  e. **4C-4**— same as No Project but with 26 ag fields operating year round (two crops)—yields fastest cleanup time of 29 years to 3.1 ppb Cr[VI] and 75 years to 1.2 ppb Cr[VI].
- 1  f. **4C-5**—an above-ground treatment facility at and near source to remove chromium from groundwater and disposal of chromium elsewhere plus 10 ag fields operating 8 months

per year (one crop) for lower chromium levels to the north-- yields second slowest cleanup time of 50 years to 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) and 95 years to 1.2 ppb Cr(VI).

4. Check the environmental impact(s) are you willing to accept as part of the final chromium cleanup strategy.

- a. Some temporary lowering of water table, to be restored in future.
- b. Lots of lowering of water table with possible permanent aquifer compaction and land subsidence, and changes in water chemistry (arsenic or uranium) in wells. Mitigation to be provided: alternate water supply, and water table and water quality restored in future<sup>1</sup>—water yield likely not restored if compaction occurs.
- c. Loss of use of domestic well for indoor use and given alternate water supply; domestic well can still be used for outdoor uses, such as landscaping. Mitigation would be alternate water supply, with water table restored in future.
- d. Loss of endangered desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel habitat in the project area, with possible land swap elsewhere for habitat.
- e. Some temporary byproducts in aquifer (manganese, iron, arsenic) due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future.
- f. Lots of temporary byproducts (manganese, iron, arsenic) to groundwater due to in-situ remediation, with water quality to be restored in future. Mitigation until aquifer is restored will be monitoring and possible alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- g. Some temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase in groundwater from additional agricultural fields, with water quality to be restored in future.
- h. Lots of temporary TDS (total dissolved solids) increase affecting groundwater quality from many additional agricultural fields. Mitigation will be to provide alternate water supply until water quality is restored in future.
- i. Leaving chromium in the aquifer at the source area as solid Cr(III) (trivalent<sup>2</sup>).
- j. Leaving chromium in the soil at the agricultural unit areas as solid Cr(III) (trivalent).

<sup>1</sup> depending on the alternative – would be from 30-100 years.

<sup>2</sup> Cr(VI) hexavalent chromium is the toxic form of chromium. Cr(III) trivalent chromium has very low toxicity.