To find information on	Read here (text and tables)	Look here (figures)
Project alternative descriptions	Section 2.9, pp. 2-14 through 2-29	Figures 2-3 through 2-8
Summaries of water resource impacts	Table 3.1-1, pp. 3.1-2 through 3.1-4	
Comparison of water impacts between	Table 3.1-2, pp. 3.1-5 through 3.1-7	
alternatives		
Existing conditions:		
Nitrate	pp. 3.1-30 through 3.1-31	Figure 3.1-8
TDS	pp. 3.1-28 through 3.1-30	Figure 3.1-7
Manganese	pp. 3.1- 33 through 3.1-33	Figure 3.1-11
Iron	pp. 3.1-32 through 3.1-33	Figure 3.1-10
Arsenic	pp. 3.1-31 through 3.1-32	Figure 3.1-9
Chromium	pp. 3.1-26 through 3.1-28	Figure 3.1-5 and 6
Uranium	pp. 3.1-33 through 3.1-34	
Remediation systems	Section 3.1.5, pp. 3.1-35 through 3.1-39	Figure 2-2e
Significance criteria for water resource impacts	Section 3.1.7, pp. 3.1-45 through 3.1-49	
Groundwater drawdown by alternative	Table 3.1-8, p. 3.1-55	Figures 3.1-14 through 3.1-18
Number of private wells affected by drawdown	Table 3.1-9, p. 3.1-56	
by alternative		
Chromium 3 in aquifer from in-situ remediation	p. 3.1-67	
Chromium 3 in aquifer from agricultural units	p. 3.1-36	
Areas of byproduct potential impacts by		Figures 3.1-19 through 3.1-23
alternative		
Water Resource Mitigation Measures		
Groundwater drawdown	MM-1, 2, & 2c: pp. 3.1-89 through 92; pp.	
	3.1-95 through 3.1-97.	
Remediation byproducts	MM-2: pp.3.1-90 through 3.1-92; MM-2b:	
	pp. 3.1-93 through 95; MMs-4, 5, 6, & 7:	
	pp.3.1-97 through 3.1-100.	
Chromium plume "bulge"	MM-2: pp. 3.1-90 through 3.1-92; MM-2a:	
	pp. 3.1-92 through 3.1-93.	
Desert Tortoise mitigation measures	Section 3.7.7, pp. 3.7-46 through 3.7-49	Figures 3.7-4 through 3.7-9
Impacts to population and housing	Section 3.2.6.3, pp. 3.2-22 through 3.2-23	
Socioeconomic impacts	Section 3.12, pp. 3.12-1 through 3.12-8	

Guide to Draft Environmental Impact Report, Chromium Groundwater Cleanup Strategy, PG&E Hinkley Compressor Station

Lahontan Water Board, October 2012 CEQA Lead Agency