MEETING MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:
Evelio (Billy) Hernandez
Larry Griep
Jim Dodd
Nick Grill
Stephanie Isaacson (Co-Chair)
Jon Quass (Co-Chair)
Lester White
Larry Notario
Lee Lewis
Joel Valenzuela
Kevin Sullivan

Independent Review Panel Manager:
Dr. Ian Webster

Welcome (Jason Keadjian, CAC Facilitator)
• Thank you for coming out tonight.
• Stated he has two jobs at this meeting:
  1. Keep this meeting on time, we have 2 hrs.
  2. Keep this meeting on track. Meaning, we allow the speakers to have their time to present, the public has their opportunity to speak during their allotted period.
• There are comment cards in the back, please fill out and give to Jessica Davtian or myself.
• We have two comment periods, one in the beginning and one towards the end, 10 minutes for each. Each person gets 3 minutes to speak.
• This is the twelfth meeting of the Community Advisory Committee.
• After the agenda was published, the committee members, through the IRP manager, asked that we make some changes. Item # 7 (Items From Committee Members) will come after item # 2 (Announcements) Making it item #3. We are eliminating item #4 (Review of Items From May 24 Meeting).
• Due to the request of some Community Members we have modified the layout of the room; please provide us with feedback.
• We have a couple new Committee Members; this is the second term of this committee.

I. CALL TO ORDER (John Quass, 6:07PM)

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS John Quass (Co-Chair)
  1. Introduction of new and continuing CAC members:
• Joel Valenzuela:
  o Hinkley resident, been on the Committee 1 yr.
• Lee Lewis:
  o New to the Committee
• Larry Notario:
  o New to the Committee, Principal at Hinkley Elementary
• Lester White:
  o Been on the Committee for 1 yr., was in an accident last Saturday, ribs were crushed.
• Jon Quass (co-chair):
  o 2nd year on the Committee, local resident and teacher in the school district.
• Kevin Sullivan (PG&E):
  o Works with PG&E taking over technical side, replacing Bob Doss (retired), provide CAC with technical info,
• Stephanie Isaacson:
  o Director of PG&E works with community, environmental cleanup projects and has been working here for over 1 yr.
• Nick Grill:
  o Hinkley resident, new to the Committee
• Jim Dodd:
  o Hinkley resident, 2nd yr. on the Committee, wants to keep things moving forward
• Larry Griep:
  o New Member
• Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
  o Hinkley resident, first year serving on CAC, repeated his intro in Spanish
• Ian Webster (IRP Manager):
  o Engineer, works for the CAC, IRP manager, goal is to help community and the CAC with technical issues/information
• Jon Quass:
  o Thank you, these are the Committee Members that will be serving over the next year, introduces Ray Gonzalez (PG&E)

2. PG&E Presentation to Barstow Unified School District Board:

Ray Gonzalez:
  • Importance of ongoing community partnership
  • Announced beautification program for school and intention to present school board with a check at their August meeting.
John Quass:
- Thank you Ray, states that the fence looks nice, describes fence.

Community Member:
- States the Community doesn’t care about the fence, they just want clean water.

III. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

John Quass:
- Stated that they are going to let the committee address the concerns the community had and still has with PG&E.
- Acknowledged the turn out at the open houses.
- Stated the importance of the Hinkley Ground Water Project, and getting information out to community members.
- Indicated that the CAC’s mission is to:
  1. Provide the Community with their prospective on PG&E’s work
  2. To facilitate Community and CAC impute back to PG&E.
  3. To advise PG&E of the decisions of the community
- With the help of the IRP manager (Ian Webster), the committee is able to discuss the technical issues involved in this process with PG&E.
- Stated they are going to discuss the Whole House Water Replacement Program. Thanks PG&E for the systems and states that the CAC is concerned about 3 things:
  1. Who is going to pay and operate the water systems in the long run? What is the long term water supply solution? Requested greater clarity.
  2. Property Purchase program should not end in December, but continue for as long as the community faces the life style choices driven by the presence of PG&E’s Chromium-6 and possibly the arsenic and manganese in the local ground water.
  3. Requested more information regarding where the plume is emerging and what is in it.
- Stated the community’s concern regarding Uranium in the ground water. Acknowledges that PG&E didn’t put the Uranium in the water but wants to know if pumping is causing a problem.
- Shared that there are reports of black ground water in the SW portion of the plume.
- Expressed that the CAC is committed to actively expressing to PG&E and the Water Board the community’s concerns so that the cleaning up of the plume continues.

Jim Dodd:
- Stated concern about the plume itself, that it is moving north and the monitoring of the wells.
- Wanted PG&E to put a well head water system on his well before he gets the Chromium-6
Talked about the Uranium:
- States that the drip system is spreading the Uranium onto fields and it is drying, being carried by the wind where then the community breaths it in.

Lester White:
- Expressed his main concern is the need for safe drinking water that goes along with the state’s standard, to all homes
- Shared concern regarding other items that PG&E has had to work with and manage notably arsenic and manganese.
- Quoted Agricultural paper written by Kevin Sullivan submitted to the Water Board; “255 million gallons of water per year is being pumped.” States the IRP manager did the math and the amount of Uranium being placed on the surface of the ground is on average 10 lbs. /yr.
- Stated that he believes the Federal Government/EPA should be involved.
- Indicated people are getting lung cancer because of the uranium being distributed in the air.
- The water that is planned to go to the school has not been treated for Uranium and believes that it should be.

Joel Valenzuela:
- Stated he is not going to comment and wishes to give time to the community for questions.

Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
- Expressed concern about the 3A speciation being taken out of the Water Board order, and wants it to be back in effect.
- Stated PG&E picked the lowest point in the economy to try and buy out homes.
- Indicated all community members in the Hinkley zip code should be offered the PG&E Programs and they should last as long as the cleanup lasts.
- Property Purchase program should not have any restrictions, it should be offered to everyone.
- Requested a long term solution. Brought up the idea of Golden State coming in and isn’t supportive.

Larry Griep:
- Expressed concern over the communities’ “prized” animals. States that the water isn’t acceptable for the animals to drink.
- PG&E needs to provide the animals in the community with clean water.

Larry Notario:
• Mentioned the CAC is developing written goals. They have 8 goals so far and will finish soon, then distribute to the community.
• Stated the plume is not stagnant and is going to move and expresses the need for it to be monitored and measured.
• Replacement systems, what will happen after the 5 yrs? Who is going to pay for these systems along with repair etc?
• Talked about the school programs, schools need more than bottled water.
• Stated that the water board is not listening to the community and not taking action.

Nick Grill:
• Concerned about arsenic and manganese in individual wells. Requested more testing for these impurities
• Asked Kevin Sullivan if he has gotten the results back on his well test.
• Puts water sample on table (discolored water in gallon container).
• Stated the sample came from the Senior Center and that many wells are now producing black water when they were clean 2 yrs ago.

Kevin Sullivan
• Stated that he recently spoke with Nick Grill about these issues. PG&E along with the CAC and the Water Board are trying to better understand these issues.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Indicated that if a community member sees or smells any changes in their well to please report to PG&E.
• Stated in the past PG&E has been responsive and PG&E wants to know anything unusual that is going on in the wells so that any connection to PG&E’s work can be ruled out.

IV. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Jason Keadjian:
• There are 8 comment cards, there is 10 minutes allotted for this comment period.

Community Member:
• Stated he was a founding member of helphinkley.org, Democratic candidate for the 33rd assembly district and is here to take questions and comments back to Sacramento.
• Stated 24 yrs. is enough and we need to stop the plume before it hits Harper Lake.
• Wants Hinkley to be named a disaster area.

Community Member:
• Asked what happened to the June meeting. Why didn’t we meet?
• Asked where the treatment system is for the school. Stated it had been 5 months and nothing has been done.

Jon Quass:
• Stated the June meeting was cancelled due to the CAC needing some questions answered in order to feed it back to the community.
• Expressed that it was a very productive meeting for the CAC itself.
• Stated there were things that the CAC needed to get done in order to represent the community better.

Community Member:
• You could have done those things in May.
• Stated that the CAC should have told the community in May there wasn’t going to be a meeting in June.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Added that the decision was made to use the time to conduct an orientation for new Committee Members.

Lester White:
• Expressed that PG&E agreed to come every month, if they cannot keep their word to us why be here at all.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Stated that it was not PG&E’s decision to cancel the meeting

Community Member:
• Stated that PG&E could have told the community in May there was not going to be a June meeting.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Replied that it was a fair statement, and in the future the CAC will do a better job at communicating changes to the meeting schedule to the public sooner.

Jason Keadjian:
• Let’s keep going through the comment cards

Community Member:
• Stated she was serving on the CAC, but is now just a Hinkley resident.
• Expressed concerned for the people up north, plume boundaries to the north haven’t been completely established.
Stated she talked to PG&E representative about the Whole House Water Replacement System and PG&E stated that she was not in an area that qualifies for it.

Community Member:
- Stated he was a truck driver and delivered to PG&E for 10 yrs.
- Commented that he picked up drums with yellow/white foam on top, PG&E employees wore rubber gloves, he didn’t. He also stated that he would wash his hands and head with water from the PG&E station.
- He now has a skin problem, itching and bleeding, blames PG&E.

Community Member:
- Expressed concern about the Water Board amendment to feasibility study.
- Stated there was going to be a sign up sheet so the community can have a meeting separate from the CAC/PG&E involvement.

Lester White:
- Asked are you saying you would like to have a town meeting?

Community Member:
- Replied; Yes, Monthly.
- Reiterates importance of the Water Board’s amendment and they need community input.
- Stated that the background study was conducted poorly and needs to be redone.
- Concerned that the contamination is spreading and stated that people who didn’t have chromium in their water supply now do.

Jason Keadjian:
- Asked Jon Quass: We are out of time but would you like me to continue with the comment cards?

Jon Quass:
- Replied; go through 4 more cards

Community Member:
- Stated she has lived in Hinkley for 35 yrs.
- Asked about the bottled water they are receiving. Some people are getting Culligan and others are getting Sparkletts wants to know why?
- Asked if community members have a choice regarding which bottled water company they want to serve them.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Stated PG&E is serving a lot of water and due to a greater supply they went with an additional vendor.
• Expressed that residents may choose which water provider they prefer.

Community Member:
• Stated she was diagnosed with MS (multiple sclerosis) in 2005 after living in Hinkley for 4 years.
• Mentioned that she bathed and swam in Hinkley water.

Lester White:
• Replied that the committee would like the speaker’s contact info.

Community Member:
• Stated she is an in-home service care taker for prior speaker the past 2 years.
• Concerned about her thoroughbred horses and other animals drinking the water and eating the alfalfa in Hinkley.
• Blames the Borax Company for contamination and believes they should be investigated. Mentions a man named Edward Bryan that suggests Borax is responsible for the contamination of Hinkley water.
• Wants to get a petition going to force the state to investigate the Borax Company for possibly contaminating the water.

Community Member:
• Concerned about the well testing results going up and down and not sure how to react, afraid to take a shower.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Asked if she has talked to PG&E about the Whole House Water Program.

Community Member:
• Stated the community needs more options.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Asks again, Have you talked to PG&E at all about the Whole House Water Program because it may address the concerns she has about the quality of her water.

Community Member:
• Yes

Community Member:
• Stated his belief that the whole area is a toxic dumpsite, doesn’t think there is a plume
● Stated that he wants more than just drinking water, he needs water to bath and water his plants etc.
● Expressed the beautification of the school is a waste and no one cares about the fence they just want PG&E to clean up the water.

Jason Keadjian:
● This is the last card I have.

Community Member (speaking in Spanish/through a PG&E translator):
● Concerned about his kids and other children.
● Stated his children lived in Hinkley and moved to Barstow and are now sick.
● Conveyed he cannot afford Health Insurance.
● He worked in the dairy and now has itchy skin.

Jason Keadjian:
● Announced the next item on agenda: Water Board Update

V. REGULAR CALENDAR

1. Water Board Update (Lisa Dernbach, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board)
   ● Provides status of action paper.
   ● Two principal issues she wants to address:
     I. Issued a draft cleanup and abatement order, we are requesting public comments, as requested by committee. Main topics in amended order:
        a. Plume delineation matter, install more wells, we want to see more wells than proposed. PG&E send revised plan to install more monitoring wells.
        b. Amended order to PG&E, inject additional ground water contamination in southern part of plume allowing them to cause a 2000 ft. spread/bulging of the plume in order to prevent it from moving into school area.

     The water board is looking forward to comments, submit to Lauri Kemper comment period ends in two weeks (Aug. 10), email, mail or fax comments to water board

     II. Draft: Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be released Aug 20, 2012 and the following week will be presented to the Hinkley public.
         a. This doc analyzes what the final site cleanup will look like
         b. A stack of CDS will be brought with the 800 pg. EIR on it.

     III. (Written Update Attached)

Larry Griep:
• Stated the Water Board is paid for by citizens of Hinkley and points to its dereliction of duty.
• Commented that the Water Board knows nothing and has done nothing that they are the problem/hold up, PG&E is not solely liable.

Lisa Dernbach:
• Stated that the Water Board has done the following for the local community:
  1. Required PG&E to distribute bottled water to Hinkley residents
  2. Required PG&E to do periodic testing/sampling on domestic wells more frequently
  3. Ordered PG&E to come up with Water Replacement options

Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
• Expressed concern that every property purchased by PG&E is one less voice for the community.
• Stated the 3A order that was taken out (a paragraph was taken out from October Water Board order) needs to be reinstated.

Jim Dodd:
• Asked Lisa Dernbach if she was stating the water board was responsible for the Water Replacement System

Lisa Dernbach:
• No, but we requested PG&E to propose methods that would provide whole house water systems to residence

Jim Dodd:
• Conveyed the whole house water system was brought up through the CAC, NOT the Water Board, the Water Board was not involved, Bob Doss was testing the units before the Water Board even suggested it.

Lisa Dernbach:
• Explained that the Water Board proposed the idea before the CAC was even formed and due to a comment period it took a long time to proceeded with an order by the state of California in October.

Jason Keadjian:
• Stated he was going to continue on with the agenda and hand it over to Kevin Sullivan

2. Hinkley Ground Water Remediation Program Review (Kevin Sullivan, PG&E):
   • (Written Update Attached)
• Stated the Whole house water program is continuing, if you are within the program area we are sending out engineers to look at your wells/sample your water.

• If you are interested in property purchase PG&E is sending appraisers out.

• Everyone has a different situation, but PG&E wants to help you understand your options. If you want to explore both options PG&E is allowing you to do so.

• PG&E is extending deadline to October 15, 2012 to allow folks plenty of time to weigh their options.

• Stated right under the dairy, chromium had leaked into the lower aquifer, PG&E has successfully reversed the gradient so that the contamination is now flowing into the upper aquifer not down into the lower.

• Hydraulic Capture:
  o Pumping 1500 gal/min.
  o Green line, 10 (ppb) boundary, strong containment of that area.
  o Pumping captures the high concentration area (10ppb) and keeps it in one location

• Addressed the issue of discolored water or possible manganese contamination.

• Stated that PG&E has sampled multiple wells to try and understand what is present in the discolored water.

• Stated that black water is usually an indication of manganese.

• PG&E has produced manganese as a byproduct of injecting ethanol into the ground which reduces Chromium-6 to Chromium-3.

• PG&E monitors their production of manganese very closely.

• PG&E has taken samples from Mountain View Rd. and the Senior Center and is trying to understand what is causing the reports of discolored water.

• Talked about the drill rigs, PG&E is investigating the ground water flow, which way does it go, chemistry, similarities, differences, sharing data with Water Board and IRP manager.

• PG&E Updated Project Schedule:
  o Whole House Water Replacement Program
  o Aggressive investigation going on
  o SEP Project to replace water at the Hinkley School
  o Working on manganese mitigation programs
  o Working on biological permitting/surveying
  o Water Board is working on Environmental Impact Report

Lester White
• Asked how much water is being pumped onto the fields

Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated PG&E Pumps more in the summer than in the winter, the average in June 2012 was, 1500 gal/min.

**Lester White:**
• Quoted a statement from an report, PG&E has never used or distributed any radioactive nuclides in Hinkley.
• Mentioned at the rate that PG&E is pumping the water, 10lbs of Uranium/month is being pumped onto the ground.

**Kevin Sullivan:**
• Stated part of the EIR will address the uranium issue.
• We have found the presence of naturally occurring Uranium in the local valley.

**Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:**
• Stated, now that PG&E has found Uranium and Manganese, he would like PG&E to be responsible for testing everyone’s wells for these elements not just the chromium-6.

**Kevin Sullivan:**
• Expressed if a community member is interested in the Whole House Water option, PG&E will go out and do a complete analysis on their well which includes testing of other trace elements like Uranium and Manganese.
• Stated that PG&E has no connection to the Uranium.

**Lester White:**
• Asked the State Water Board to get an order making PG&E test for Uranium, Arsenic and Manganese.

**Lisa Dernbach:**
• Stated she needed to consult with the Water Board attorney’s

**Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:**
• Indicated he believes the plume has grown in the last couple of years, and PG&E isn’t monitoring it closely enough.

**Kevin Sullivan:**
• Stated the importance of the CAC, IRP Manager, Water Board and PG&E looking at data together to determine where the chromium-6 and Uranium is or isn’t located.

**Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:**
• Indicated PG&E needs to get started on a long term solution.
Jon Quass:
• Introduction of Dr. Ian Webster IRP Manager

3. Independent Review Panel Manager Presentation (Dr. Ian Webster)

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Explained he will take any questions at any time both in and out of the meeting.

Lester White:
• Volunteers for the Co-Chair position.

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Explained his mission:
  o To answer any questions the community has.
  o To provide the community with information to make decisions and inflict change.
• Stated the water in Hinkley independent from PG&E is not good to drink. Lots of contaminants occur naturally due to basaltic granite alluvial conditions there are minerals in the ground water that have been there long before PG&E
• Explained he works for the CAC not PG&E.
• Stated the Whole House Water Replacement System is the first step to decoupling the public from any harm of drinking the water
• Mentioned there was a June meeting, but the feeling with the CAC was they wanted to attempt to have a 4 hr. plus meeting related to in-depth technical issues.
• Open house July 11/12, had over 100 Community Members as well as the Water Board attend.
  o Addressed Whole House Water issues/questions
  o All questions asked by the CAC during this time has been put in a letter that will go to the Water Board
• Stated Chromium 6 cleanup standard does not currently exist in the state of California.
• Three grand chunks in water replacement schedule.
  o August 31, 2012 → the homes 3.1 and greater have to have systems installed
  o December 31, 2012 → Property Purchase ends
  o August 2013 → all homes in effected area (3.1 plume + 1 mile) with detect .06 will have a chance to get Whole House Water Replacement System installed.
• Stated he was here to give independent guidance, he is an engineer, and can hopefully add back bone to decision making process
• Indicated that PG&E is giving the best available control technology:
  o The ion exchange in conjunction with the reverse osmosis will undoubtedly take every single atom of Chromium-6 associated metal out and give quality water to the community.
• Talked about the IRP Manager’s office, where the public can view the plume map, data tables etc. for discussion, and crunch numbers to verify PG&E data.
• IRP Manager’s office will have no time limit.
• Stated the more data PG&E is able to get the better the community will have an idea of what to expect and how to start treating.

Community Member:
• Why isn’t pumping station part of ground water remediation?

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Replied, PG&E has installed 2 modules of pumping stations that basically add ethanol and recycle the water removing the Chromium-6.
• Water reversal/pumping causing the water to no longer move north. Plume keeps expanding; believes plume expansion is due to the plume being snipped in the middle because of the aggressive pumping of PG&E.

Community Member:
• Expressed concern regarding turning faucet on and getting a smell and its starting to come up into the toilet and smell as well.

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Suggested to get in touch with PG&E to have them looked at the problem.

Community Member:
• 39 year resident of Hinkley
  • Asked where does PG&E get water to go into pumping station, is it contaminated before it goes in or only after?

Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated PG&E gets its water from the under flow of the Mojave River
• Stated in general the water quality and quantity is better closer toward the river
• At the station there are a series/network of 3 or 4 wells that pump water (PG&E 6, PG&E 12, PG&E 14, FW1 and FW2), they pump water to:
  o PG&E station
  o Up North for fresh water injection
  o Dairy
Community Member:
• Asked is that water clean? Why can’t the community get this water?

Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated this is the water that will also be going to the school
• The community water was addressed in the Feasibility study

Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
• Asked why the dairy was getting the water?

Kevin Sullivan:
• The Dairy’s well goes down into the lower aquifer and was contaminating it with Chromium-6. PG&E has been replacing the dairy’s water supply and thus reducing the contamination of the lower aquifer.

Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
• Expressed that he believes the dairy gets the water due to profit gain of PG&E.

Kevin Sullivan:
• Replied, No, we supply the dairy with water to help the remediation.
• Stated the Dairy has a cross-screened well, meaning that it pulls from both aquifers.
• Explained, across most of the plume the water wants to flow from the lower to the upper aquifer. The only place this wasn’t true was at the dairy which is why we cut it off and now supply the dairy with water.

Community Member:
• Asked if the water PG&E is pumping back into the water supply contains Uranium?

Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated that he did not know the answer to that, but the water does not have chromium-6.

Dr. Ian Webster : return to presentation
• Expressed the public has big decisions to make and he wants them to make the right decision with the right information.
• Stated the CAC will be posting updates and information in the Hinkley Market.
• During the June CAC meeting we discussed
  o Whole House Water Replacement Program
  o Schedule, eligibility criteria
Property Purchase Program
• What happens after the 5 yr. MCL standard adoption point
  • Chromium-6 MCL: will have significant effect on how this process is treated. 1-2 years away from being determined
  • CAC is interested in the Final Remedy.
  • PGE was asked to provide a schedule for the Whole House Water Program to the Water Board, August 31, 2012 (for the 17), and August 31, 2013 for everyone else.
• Answers the Question: what happens when well readings go up and down?
  • If you have 4 successive quarter measurements that are less than the chromium-6 MCL PG&E can stop funding and operating water units
• Plume at Thomson Road location is hydraulically decoupled. Upper and lower part. What this means is the water will not be further contaminated with Chromium-6. Water is going back on itself no more movement.
• Kevin is your team monitoring it?
  
Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated yes. PG&E is looking into what the long term affects are.

Community Member:
• Commented, Hinkley was a dump site before the plume was even here.
• Asked why it wasn’t cleaned up the first time? Why can’t we use the same methods we used back then?

Kevin Sullivan:
• Stated the reason the plume is so big is due to the sandy soil. The sandy soil doesn’t grab the chromium, doesn’t slow it down.

Community Member:
• Asked why PG&E will not test her well.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Requested that the community member provide PG&E herr information.

Community Member:
• Asked, if the wells that go to PG&E are being tested? Are they contaminated?

Kevin Sullivan:
• PG&E tests all water that comes into the plant and publishes all their well results

Community Member:
• Asked, what is PG&E using to cool their station? What is PG&E doing differently than before besides taking the Chromium out?

Kevin Sullivan:
• PG&E has not used Chromium-6 since the 1950’s, PG&E now uses non Chromium phosphate and the ponds are lined, they are managed under permits from the water board.

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Feasibility study resulted in 2 choices:
  o Ion Exchange
  o Deep Well
• Quality of ground water in Hinkley valley separate from PG&E and Chromium 6 is not good.
• Arsenic, Manganese, Uranium and TDS are all part of the base water footprint

Community Member:
• Asked, What about the animals? Prized stallion, scared to drink water

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Stated he was not a vet/toxicologist.
• Suggested taking a water sample to the vet and having them counsel community members regarding animal health.

Community Member:
• Asked if PG&E is forcing the public to sign a document giving up any rights when they agree to a water system.

Stephanie Isaacson:
• Replied that PG&E is having community members sign an access agreement to place the systems on their property, but nothing else. No one is asked to sign away any rights to receive a water system.

Evelio (Billy) Hernandez:
• Stated, this is all a temporary solution. Asked about the taxes and costs associated with the water systems after the 5 years
• Stated that he would get the water system if he knew it wouldn’t cost him anything and it didn’t prevent him from the Property Purchase option.

Community Member:
• Just because PG&E states that the plume is in these lines, don’t you think they might be wrong?

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Stated the improvement on background study methods to find out the natural occurrence of Chromium-6 and the levels of chromium-6 placed after PG&E contamination as described in paragraph 3A of the order.
• Said he thinks there is background chromium-6, in other areas of the US there is Chromium-6 naturally occurring especially in the California desert.
• Chromium is one of the most abundant metals on the planet. Combo of chromium, rock and water has created a base. PG&E did contribute. They are responsible for their chromium-6 but not every single chromium-6 ion.

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Recommended people read the Los Angeles Times on Saturday,
  o Cadiz Water Supply Project:
    ▪ Discusses the issue of high level Chromium-6 in an area where there is no industrial buildings
    ▪ Proving Chromium-6 does occur naturally

Community Member:
• How many people have chosen the deep well option?

Kevin Sullivan:
• I don’t know, we are seeing a lot of people looking at multiple options

Dr. Ian Webster:
• Come and talk to me at the new IRP Office, or online at hinkleygroundwater.com

Jon Quass:
• Asked the community,
  o Do you like the change in the meeting?
  o Chance to talk in the beginning?
  o How do you like the format?
• Stated we need to make adjustments and the CAC wants feedback.

Jason Keadjian:
• Stated we are about an hour over so I’m going to direct it back to Jon.

Jon Quass:
• Thanked the community
VI. ADJOURN (John Quass 8:59PM)
Status of Actions For
PG&E Hinkley Chromium Contamination
July 25, 2012

Enforcement

1. Cleanup and Abatement Order for Whole House Water Supply: Revised Order (R6V-2011-0005A2) issued on June 7, 2012. Latest results show that seventeen active domestic wells have chromium above maximum background levels and qualify for replacement water supply.

   a. The Water Board Executive Officer agreed to accept PG&E's expanded program offering replacement water to all residents in the chromium affected area. The CAO provides deadlines for installing alternate water for domestic wells with chromium greater than maximum background levels and for domestic wells with chromium less than max background levels.

   b. The Water Board Executive Officer acknowledged PG&E's feasibility study evaluating alternatives to provide whole house replacement water and revisions as being complete pending community acceptance of recommended water supply methods. The feasibility study can be reviewed on the web at: www.geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov.

2. Draft Clean and Abatement Order for public comment: Amended Draft Order (R6V-2008-0002A4) issued on July 25, 2012 requests public comments. Order requires PG&E to (1) submit a revised workplan for defining the entire chromium plume, (2) requires future plume maps to include chromium data from domestic wells exceeding maximum background values that are not replicated in monitoring wells, and (3) permits PG&E to expand the lateral spreading of the south eastern plume boundary by 1,000 feet to accommodate increased discharges from extraction wells for plume containment. Comments due by August 10, 2012.

Investigative and Reporting Orders

1. Chromium Plume Boundary
   a. The second quarter 2012 chromium plume map is expected to be submitted by end of July. New plume map will be posted on the Water Board website at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan, on the PG&E Hinkley Chromium Cleanup page, at the bottom of page.
   b. PG&E continues to install monitoring wells for defining the chromium plume boundaries to the west.
   c. PG&E submitted a workplan on July 9, 2012 to install eight new wells to the north to define the plume boundaries. Water Board staff is requiring a revised workplan to address all undefined boundaries of the plume.
2. Plume Containment
The March 14, 2012 Settlement Agreement included an amendment to the 2008 CAO requiring new methods to measure plume containment south of Thompson Road. The third progress report evaluating plume containment was submitted on June 15, 2012. Reports so far, reflect compliance with Water Board’s order for plume containment.

3. Plume Cleanup
PG&E’s submitted a new plan to address the manganese migration in groundwater from the Central Area In-situ Remediation Zone (IRZ). Board staff verbally accepted the plan on May 17 and told PG&E cleanup directives will be formalized in a new enforcement action.

Background Chromium

At the June 2012 Water Board meeting, staff presented results from UC Davis Statistical Laboratory on a re-evaluation of some of the existing chromium background data. Water Board staff has discussed review of PG&E’s February 2012 Background Study proposal with the CAC’s consultant, Dr. Webster, and is working with the State Water Board to develop a contract with the three 2011 peer reviewers (the same ones who provided comments on PG&E’s 2007 Background Study report). The State Water Board contract would allow the 2011 reviewers to provide technical advice to Water Board staff and the CAC on PG&E’s February 2012 Background Study proposal. At Water Board staff’s request, Dr. Izbicki of the US Geological Survey provided verbal comments on PG&E’s February 2012 Background Study proposal.

Water Board Actions leading to ordering PG&E to implement final cleanup strategy

November 2010 – July 2011: Scoping period to identify environmental impacts and issues associated with implementation of PG&E’s Feasibility Study alternatives for comprehensive cleanup of the chromium contamination. Water Board held public meetings, requested and received technical reviews by USEPA and California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Water Board staff required Feasibility Study addenda be prepared by PG&E based on comments and questions from the public, agencies and the Water Board.

August 2011 - October 2011: At Water Board’s request, independent reviewers conducted review of 2007 PG&E Background Chromium Study Report.

December 8, 2011: Water Board staff public information meeting held on plume status, whole household water replacement order, peer review results, and the cleanup alternatives to be evaluated the environmental impact report.

April-July 2012: Water Board staff are reviewing and finalizing the draft Environmental Impact Report (draft EIR) with their consultant, ICF International. The draft EIR is being prepared to evaluate impacts from the proposed cleanup strategies of the chromium plume in groundwater.

Mid-August 2012: The draft EIR will be released for 60-day public review. Water Board staff will hold a public review workshop at the Hinkley School on August 29, and the Water Board will hold a public meeting in Barstow on September 12 to preview the draft EIR. Information will be the same at each meeting.

January 2013: Water Board to consider certifying draft EIR, adopting new general permit for cleanup activities, and discussing an upcoming Cleanup and Abatement Order with schedule and cleanup goals. The Water Board will consider adopting this new CAO spring 2013.
July 25, 2012

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT DRAFT CLEANUP AND ABATEMENT ORDER TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY HINKLEY COMPRESSOR STATION, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Lahontan Water Board) will accept comments on a draft Cleanup and Abatement Order (Order). Written comments must be received by 5:00 PM, August 10, 2012, and addressed to:

Lauri Kemper, Assistant Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
or to lkemper@waterboards.ca.gov
or by facsimile at (530) 544-2271.

Draft Cleanup and Abatement Order

A copy of the draft Order is enclosed with this notice. The draft Order is also available on the Lahontan Water Board website at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan, in the "Orders" section on the PG&E Hinkley Chromium Cleanup page.

The Lahontan Water Board is interested in receiving comments regarding all aspects of the draft Order, and specifically on the Orders section directing PG&E to:

1. Submit a revised workplan to define the chromium plume in groundwater and implement an investigation.
2. Submit a report discussing the investigation results to define the plume; and

Allowing PG&E to increase the lateral spreading of the chromium plume on the eastern boundary by an additional 1,000 feet to allow for increased discharges from extraction wells to prevent plume migration in the northwestern area.
Questions

Questions on the draft Order should be directed to Lisa Dernbach at (530) 542-5424 or ldernbach@waterboards.ca.gov or myself at (530) 542-5436 or lkemper@waterboards.ca.gov.

Lauri Kemper
Assistant Executive Officer

Enclosure: Draft Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R6V-2008-0002A4

CC: PG&E Hinkley Lyris list

LSD/adv/FT: PG&E Draft CAO A4 7-12 cover letter
Send to file: (VVL) WDID 88389107001
The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Water Board), finds:

Discharger

1. The Pacific Gas and Electric Company owns and operates the Hinkley Compressor Station (hereafter the "Facility"), located at 35863 Fairview Road, Hinkley in San Bernardino County. For the purposes of this Order, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company is referred to as the "Discharger."

Regulatory History

2. On August 6, 2008, the Water Board issued Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) No. R6V-2008-0002 to the Discharger to clean up and abate the effects of waste discharges and threatened discharges containing hexavalent chromium and total chromium to waters of the State. The CAO required the Discharger to take additional corrective actions to contain chromium migrating with groundwater, to continue to implement groundwater remediation in the source area and central plume area, and to develop and implement a final cleanup strategy. The CAO also modified the monitoring and reporting program for permitted projects.

3. Paragraph 3 of the Order provisions of the CAO required the Discharger to contain the hexavalent and total chromium plumes to locations where hexavalent chromium was below the interim background level of 4 parts per billion (ppb) and the total chromium was below 50 ppb.

   a. The Discharger was required to achieve containment of the hexavalent chromium plume in the ground water by December 31, 2008, using the Discharger's Boundary Control Monitoring Program and Updated Site-Wide
Groundwater Monitoring Program (submitted July 2, 2008 and prepared by Secor International) as described in Finding 16 in the CAO.

b. The Discharger was required to achieve containment of the total chromium plume in the ground water by December 31, 2008, also based on the Boundary Control Monitoring Program and Updated Site-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Program as described in Finding 16 in the CAO.

4. Paragraph 4 of the Order provisions of the CAO required the Discharger to continue implementing full-scale in-situ corrective actions in the source area and central area of the chromium plume, or an alternate but equally effective method, to remEDIATE the elevated chromium concentrations in groundwater.

5. The CAO required the Discharger to clean up and abate the chromium plume to background levels and set an interim amount of 4 ppb. Amended Order No. R6V-2008-0002A1 (Amended Order No. 1), effective November 12, 2008, adopted average and maximum background levels for hexavalent chromium of 1.2 ppb and 3.1 ppb, respectively. The adopted average and maximum background levels in Amendment Order No. 1 for total chromium are 1.5 ppb and 3.2 ppb, respectively. These background levels were adopted for the purposes of establishing background water quality conditions to be used later to consider cleanup strategies and to support future decisions regarding cleanup levels. For plume containment, the level remained at 4 ppb for both hexavalent chromium and total chromium.

6. Amended Order No. R6V-2008-0002A2 (Amended Order No. 2), effective April 7, 2009, allowed lateral migration of the 4 ppb hexavalent chromium plume boundary east of the South Central ReInjection Area (SCRI A) from discharges to groundwater piped from extraction wells in the northwest plume area. Lateral plume expansion of 1,000 feet was allowed as long as it could be shown that the chromium would be captured by the existing groundwater extraction system in the downgradient flow direction.

7. On April 9, 2008, the Water Board adopted General Waste Discharge Requirements (Board Order No. R6V-2008-0014) for the Hinkley chromium contamination to facilitate groundwater remediation. Board Order No. R6V-2008-0014 allows the discharge of various products to facilitate cleanup of groundwater contamination in the area from the Compressor Station in the south to almost Thompson Road in the north. To be authorized to initiate discharge, the Discharger must submit a Notice of Intent describing the proposed remedial project and discharges to land and/or groundwater. Following a public comment period, the Executive Officer was authorized to issue a Notice of Applicability (NOA) that allow the discharge or discharges and prescribed an appropriate monitoring and reporting program.

8. On April 7, 2009, the Water Board Executive Officer issued an NOA allowing the Discharger to implement the South Central ReInjection Area (SCRI A) and Northwest Freshwater Injection project (NWFI). The SCRI A project involves the pumping of up
to 110 gallons per minute (gpm) of chromium-contaminated groundwater from up to six extraction wells in the northwestern plume area. Groundwater is piped southward, amended with ethanol, and discharged into injection wells in the SCRIA. The project intent was to hydraulically contain plume migration in the northwestern plume area and to reduce chromium injected to the SCRIA from the dissolved hexavalent form Cr(VI) to the solid form Cr(III). The SCRIA project began discharges to groundwater in October 2009. But beginning in early 2011, discharges were scaled back to 55 gpm when monitoring data indicated that plume spreading described in Finding No. 6 threatened to exceed the 1,000 feet distance allowed on the southeastern boundary.

**Undefined Chromium Plume in Upper Aquifer**

9. Pursuant to orders from the Water Board, the Discharger has undertaken multiple investigations for defining the chromium plume in the upper aquifer to background levels. The document *First Quarter 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Report* describes the results of groundwater and domestic well sampling during January to March 2012. A map in the report shows the extent of chromium in groundwater at concentrations exceeding background levels as being greater than 5 miles in length and about 2 miles in width. In a majority of cases where new monitoring wells have been installed, detected chromium concentrations exceed those in nearby domestic wells by up to four times. In a few cases, detected chromium concentrations in monitoring wells are significantly less than concentrations detected in domestic wells suggesting differences in well construction and sampling depth.

The quarterly report shows that the chromium plume continues to be undefined to the south, east, and north of the plume core area. Further investigations are needed to assess the chromium plume, compare concentrations to nearby domestic wells, and assess groundwater flow in the upper aquifer in order to evaluate threats to beneficial uses. It is anticipated that the Discharger will use monitoring well pairs and triplets and associated infrastructure to sample and monitor for the existence of chromium in groundwater.

10. On July 9, 2012, the Discharger submitted a workplan to install additional wells for chromium plume definition. The workplan, prepared by Stantec, proposed installing wells at eight locations in the northern plume area. The proposed well locations however are not adequate to fully define the chromium plume boundaries at monitoring points within one-quarter mile of other monitoring locations or the prior plume boundary. In addition, the workplan does not account for domestic wells containing chromium concentrations at 2.0 ppb or greater, which may be indicative of diluted plume concentrations at greater levels. While the workplan does not state reasoning for large gaps in sampling locations, PG&E has stated in the past its inability to gain access to certain private property and to endangered desert tortoise habitat. A revised workplan is being requested by Water Board staff.
11. This Order amends CAO No. R6V-2008-0002 to require the Discharger to define the entire chromium plume in the upper aquifer where it is still unknown.

**Expansion of Chromium Plume Boundary**

12. Chromium in groundwater downgradient of the Facility continues to adversely affect groundwater quality.

13. This Order amends CAO No. R6V-2008-0002A2 to allow additional lateral migration of the 3.1 ppb (previously 4 ppb) hexavalent chromium eastern plume boundary during implementation of cleanup projects in other areas of the chromium plume. This action will enable the Discharger to resume groundwater extraction in the northwestern plume area to the 110 gpm volume described in Finding No. 8. The additional plume expansion is not expected to adversely affect groundwater receptors, such as domestic wells. Corrective actions proposed by the Discharger are the only feasible methods available at this time until the Environmental Impact Report is certified and general waste discharge requirements are issued allowing additional options to the Discharger for disposal of chromium-contaminated groundwater.

**CEQA**

14. This enforcement action is being taken by this regulatory agency to enforce the provisions of the California Water Code, and as such is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.) in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15321. The implementation of this CAO Amendment is an action to assure the restoration of the environment and is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, and in accordance with the California Code of Regulations, title 14, sections 15301 and 15303. The existing monitor well pairs and triplets and infrastructure are subject to section 15301 because there is negligible or no expansion of their existing uses.

**EFFECT OF PRIOR ORDERS**

15. This Order amends CAO No. R6V-2008-0002. All findings in prior Orders of the Water Board not directly superseded by findings in this Order remain in effect. This Order shall not be construed to preclude enforcement against the Discharger for failure to comply with any requirement in any other Order issued by the Water Board.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that, pursuant to the Water Code sections 13267 and 13304, the Discharger shall clean up and abate the effects of the discharge and threatened discharge of chromium to waters of the State, and shall comply with the provisions of this Order:

1. **Chromium Plume Definition in the Upper Aquifer**
The Discharger must define the extent of chromium in the upper aquifer within the targeted areas shown on the chromium plume maps in the First Quarter 2012 Groundwater Monitoring Program and the figure showing proposed well locations in the July 9, 2012 Monitoring Well Installation Workplan. The Discharger must achieve this task by ensuring that all monitoring wells can replicate chromium concentrations in nearby domestic wells to greater than detected values or no more than 0.5 ppb less than detected values.

A. Within 21 days of the date of this Order, the Discharger must submit a workplan proposing sampling locations in the upper aquifer in the following areas that will allow for the definition of the chromium plume to at least maximum background concentrations of 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) and 3.2 ppb Cr(T), be able to replicate chromium concentrations in nearby domestic wells so that water samples are not more than 0.5 ppb less than concentrations in nearby domestic wells, and verify groundwater flow.

- Southern boundary: southeast of wells BW-01s and BW-01D at the Facility.
- Eastern boundary: east of wells MW-115 and MW-145 on Dixie Road.
- Northern boundary: north of wells MW-154; west of Mountain View Road (north of Salinas Road); and east of Fairview Road extension (north of Sonoma Road).
- At all locations where domestic wells contain concentrations of 2.0 ppb or greater for hexavalent or total chromium.

The proposed sampling locations must be previously scoped out to assure a reasonable probability of success in gaining access and likelihood of well installation or temporary groundwater sampling. The workplan shall discuss and mark on the map areas where previous attempts to gain access to private properties and desert tortoise habitat have been unsuccessful.

B. By September 30, 2012, the Discharger must submit a report that is able to define the extent of chromium in groundwater for hexavalent chromium and total chromium to at least the maximum background levels of 3.1 ppb and 3.2 ppb, respectively, and be able to determine the direction of groundwater flow. The report must contain the following additional information:

1. Maps:
   a. Extent of chromium in groundwater in the upper aquifer:
      i. A map showing the plume boundary throughout the uppermost saturated zone.
      ii. A separate map showing the plume boundary in the lowermost saturated zone.
   b. Potentiometric map showing the groundwater flow direction in all areas discussed in Item A.
2. Map Content:
   a. Text font size on maps shall be 9 points or greater.
   b. Street names must be shown in black color to be easily legible.
   c. Chromium boundary lines on plume maps must reflect the reported data.
   d. Plume boundary lines must show monitoring well concentration contours representing the maximum extent of the following: 50 ppb Cr(T), 10 ppb Cr(VI) or Cr(T), 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) or 3.2 ppb Cr(T). The dashed line representing the boundary of 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) or 3.2 ppb Cr(T) shall be a dark color so as to stand out and be drawn to connect any monitoring well located within 2,000 ft of any other monitoring well having chromium concentrations of 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) or 3.2 ppb Cr(T) or greater.
      i. Where access to private property or endangered species habitat has not been granted for six months or more, the chromium plume boundary shall be drawn around any domestic well containing chromium concentrations exceeding 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) or 3.2 ppb Cr(T) for at least two consecutive quarters and within one-half mile distance of the prior quarter's plume boundary.
      ii. Where monitoring wells are unable to replicate chromium concentrations in nearby domestic wells within 0.5 ppb, the chromium plume boundary shall be drawn around any domestic well having concentrations exceeding 3.1 ppb Cr(VI) or 3.2 ppb Cr(T) for at least two consecutive quarters and within one-quarter mile distance of the monitoring well.

3. Report Content:
   a. Description of methods and actions for installing wells
   b. Laboratory results:
      i. Sample results showing a difference of 25% or greater between Cr(VI) and Cr(T) concentrations shall be re-tested and the ensuing results described.
   c. Interpretation of chromium plume boundary.
   d. If the chromium plume boundary is undefined in certain areas (sampling locations are 2,000 feet distance or more), propose additional sampling locations and implementation schedule.
   e. Include boring logs and well designs.
   f. Geologic cross sections across the northern plume extent (from Salinas Road and north).
   g. Report must be uploaded to the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker database, within two working days of the due date.

II. Expansion of Chromium Plume Boundary
A. This Order amends CAO R6V-2008-0002 to allow lateral spreading of the 3.1 ppb Cr (VI) (previously 4 ppb) eastern plume boundary from 1,000 feet now to no more than 2,000 feet and south of Acacia Street, as shown on the attached map, and shall not extend to areas of existing groundwater use. Lateral spreading of the plume must be monitored and described in monitoring reports required pursuant to Board Orders No. R6V-2008-0002 and R6V-2008-0014. Lateral plume expansion out to 2,000 feet is allowed as long as the Discharger shows that the chromium is being captured by the existing groundwater extraction system in the downgradient flow direction. If the Discharger is unable to prove that chromium in the expanded plume is not being captured in the downgradient flow direction, it will constitute a violation of this Order.

III. Laboratory Analysis

All future analysis of water samples must utilize the most recent testing methods. Testing for Total Chromium analysis must be done using US EPA Methods 6010B or 6020A to a reporting limit of 1 ppb. Testing for Hexavalent Chromium must be conducted in accordance with US EPA Method SW 218.6 with a reporting limit of 0.1 ppb. The laboratory used must be certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

IV. Liability for Oversight Costs Incurred by the Water Board

The Discharger shall be liable, pursuant to Water Code 13304, to the Water Board for all reasonable costs incurred by the Water Board to investigate unauthorized discharges of waste, or to oversee cleanup of such waste, abatement of the effects thereof, or other remedial action, pursuant to this Order. The Discharger shall reimburse the Water Board for all reasonable costs associated with site investigation, oversight, and cleanup. Failure to pay any invoice for the Water Board’s investigation and oversight costs within the time stated in the invoice (or within thirty days after the date of invoice, if the invoice does not set forth a due date) shall be considered a violation of this Order. If the Property is enrolled in a State Water Board-managed reimbursement program, reimbursement shall be made pursuant to this Order and according to the procedures established in that program.

V. Certifications for all Plans and Reports

All technical and monitoring plans and reports required in conjunction with this Order are required pursuant to Water Code section 13267 and shall include a statement by the Discharger, or an authorized representative of the Discharger, certifying (under penalty of perjury in conformance with the laws of the State of California) that the workplan and/or report is true, complete, and accurate. Hydrogeologic reports and plans shall be prepared or directly supervised by, and signed and stamped by a Professional Geologist or Civil Engineer registered in California. It is expected that all interpretations and conclusions of data in these documents to be truthful, supported with
evidence, with no attempts to mislead by false statements, exaggerations, deceptive presentation, or failure to include essential information.

VI. No Limitation of Water Board Authority

This Order in no way limits the authority of this Water Board to institute additional enforcement actions or to require additional investigation and cleanup of the site consistent with the Water Code. This Order may be revised by the Executive Officer or Water Board representative as additional information becomes available.

VII. Enforcement Options

Failure to comply with the terms or conditions of this Order will result in additional enforcement action that may include the imposition of administrative civil liability pursuant to California Water Code sections 13268 and 13350 or referral to the Attorney General of the State of California for such legal action as she may deem appropriate.

VIII. Right to Petition: Any person aggrieved by this action of the Lahontan Water Board may petition the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date of this Order, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality or will be provided upon request.

Patty Kouyoumdjian
Executive Officer

Date
PG&E Update on Activities July 26, 2012

Voluntary Whole House Water Program
- If you have questions about your eligibility for whole house replacement water programs, please contact us at (760) 253-7896 by email at HinkleyInfo@pge.com or visit our Hinkley Community Resource Office located at 22999 Community Boulevard.
- We are open Monday through Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and are meeting with eligible residents to discuss the program.

Community Advisory Committee
- Independent Review Panel (IRP) Oversight subcommittee met once since the May 24, 2012 CAC meeting with IRP manager to discuss the Replacement Water Supply Feasibility Study Report, Remediation and other PG&E programs.
- New Membership Subcommittee met once since the May 24, 2012 CAC meeting to select new members.
- New and continuing members met in conjunction with the IRP oversight committee for a committee orientation.

Reports and Other Submittals to the Water Board
- June 5 - Revised April 2012 Water Level Data Report
- June 6 - Revised Replacement Water Supply Feasibility Study Report
- June 8 - 1st QTR 2012 EMP Report
- June 15 - May 2012 Hydraulic Capture Monitoring Report
- June 21 - Detailed WHW Implementation Schedule
- June 29 - Technical Memorandum: Actions to Reduce Plume Migration in Area Generally North of Thompson Road
- July 9 Work plan for installation of Upper Aquifer Monitoring wells North and East of Red Hill
- July 13 - Second Quarter 2012 Monitoring Report for the In Situ Reactive Zone and the Northwest Freshwater Injection Projects
- July 13 - June 2012 Hydraulic Capture Monitoring Report

Community Initiatives
- PG&E, in collaboration with the San Bernardino County Workforce Development Department and other community and business partners, is working towards a workforce training and development initiative for Hinkley residents. PG&E is currently exploring options for training and hiring local residents to assist in implementing our whole house water program.

- PG&E, working with a subcommittee of the Community Advisory Committee, is preparing a Community Investment Plan which will consist of a number of charitable grants to local non-profit organizations supporting the Hinkley Community.