

Exhibit 1 to Attachment A

**ERRATA TO THE
TOPOCK COMPRESSOR STATION GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION
PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Errata to the Topock Compressor Station Groundwater Remediation Project Final Environmental Impact Report

Since the issuance of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Topock Compressor Station Groundwater Remediation project, DTSC has noted minor textual errors in the document. This errata has been prepared to clarify and correct information within the Final EIR. The revisions do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

Revisions to Section 5.4 (Growth Inducement) of the FEIR

It has come to the DTSC’s attention that the revised Mitigation Measure CUL-1a-3 included in the Cultural Resources Section of the FEIR (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 4.4, pp. 4.4-64 and 4.4-65.) provided a shorter timeframe for monitoring replanted and replacement plants than Mitigation Measure AES-1 in the Aesthetics Section (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 4.1, pp. 4.1-47 - 4.1-48.) To clarify the timeframe that will be required for monitoring all replanted and replacement plants and avoid any possibility of confusion, DTSC has revised Mitigation Measure CUL-1a-3 from 3 to 5 years.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure CUL-1a-5 on pages 4.4-64 and 4.4-65 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows (the revisions and clarifications are provided herein in underline/ strikethrough format):

CUL-1a-5: Should any indigenous plants of traditional cultural significance and listed in Appendix PLA of this FEIR be identified within the project area, PG&E shall avoid, protect, and encourage the natural regeneration of the identified plants when developing the remediation design, final restoration plan, and IM-3 decommission plan. In the event that impacts on the identified plants cannot be avoided and such plants will be displaced, PG&E shall retain a qualified botanist who shall prepare a plant transplantation/monitoring plan which can be included as part of the Cultural Impact Mitigation Program (CIMP) referenced in CUL-1a-8 either by (1) transplanting such indigenous plants to an on-site location, or (2) providing a 2:1 ratio replacement to another location decided upon between PG&E and members of the Interested Tribes. Plans to transplant or replace such plants shall be approved by DTSC. In coordination with the qualified botanist, PG&E shall monitor all replanted and replacement plants for at least ~~3~~ 5 years, and shall ensure at least a 75 percent survivorship during that time. This mitigation measure is not meant to replace or subsume any actions required by state or federal entities with regard to the protection of species listed as rare, threatened, or endangered.

Revisions to Section 5.4 (Growth Inducement) of the FEIR

It has come to the DTSC's attention that the Growth Inducement section (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 5.4, p. 5-20) and Alternatives sections (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 8.0, pp. 8-38, 8-39, 8-42, 8-43, 8-47, 8-51, 8-52, 8-56, 8-60, 8-61, 8-64. And 8-70 [Table 8-3]) were unintentionally not updated to include the information regarding how additional periodic electricity would be supplied to the project when needed during peak periods or power outages. As explained in the Section 4.11 of the FEIR, during the preparation of the EIR, PG&E provided supplemental information on how electricity would be supplied for the 1.6 million additional kilowatt-hours needed to serve the proposed remedy while IM-3 continues operating. Potential sources of electricity for the proposed project would be supplemental power from the compressor station, a dedicated portable diesel fuel generator (approximately 320 kW), or small solar panels. These sources of electricity would be used either individually or in combination to meet the interim additional electrical demands of the project when IM-3 remains online and until the remedy is deemed to be operating properly and successfully. Based on this new information, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 was deleted. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant without mitigation because PG&E has adequate sources of electricity available from on-site sources. (FEIR, Volume 2, p. 4.11-7 (Utilities and Service System); see also FEIR, Volume 2, p. 3-19 (Project Description).) In addition, an error was found in the amount of energy required for Alternative F. With the correction, the amount of energy for Alternative F is greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in the estimated energy use. This information was corrected. (FEIR, Volume 2, pp. 8-51 and 8-52.) A typographical error was also changed in the analysis of Alternative H, changing the referenced Alternative from "G" to "H." (FEIR, Volume 2, p. 8-61.)

The following paragraph on page 5-20 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information (the revisions and clarifications are provided herein in underline/~~striketrough~~ format):

The project site is currently served by existing roadways, utilities, and public services. ~~While there is the chance that the proposed project could result in off-site infrastructure or service expansions related to electrical systems, which could serve other future development, due to the relatively isolated nature of the area, other limiting factors to development, and the projected growth forecasts, this additional electrical supply is not anticipated to result in substantial indirect growth, if any.~~ For these reasons, implementation of the proposed project would not result in primary or secondary environmental effects related to additional growth.

The following paragraph on pages 8-38 and 8-39 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

Alternative B would result in the installation of up to 60 new monitoring wells plus replacement wells and the new wells would not generate any effluent that would affect wastewater treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the continued operation and maintenance of the IM-3 Facility until decommissioning is determined appropriate by the lead agency. The IM-3 Facility currently discharges nonhazardous wastewater to a 2,000-gallon tank on-site, which is removed by a

wastewater disposal contractor. Because this effluent is disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and would not exceed existing treatment capacity. Because of the long period of time that would pass before attenuation would be complete and systems would be decommissioned (a best estimate of 500 years), a strong degree of speculation is involved in anticipating the available landfill capacity during the operations and maintenance and decommissioning of this component. Due to the limited construction activities proposed under Alternative B, the solid waste impact and impacts related to electrical generation impact would be much less than the proposed project. Under Alternative B a small amount of energy would be required, but compared to the proposed project the impact on energy consumption would be negligible. ~~It is assumed that all energy demands needed could be met on-site and no potential to impact on City of Needles' electrical systems would exist; therefore Impact UTIL-1 would be avoided and no mitigation would be necessary.~~ Impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than for the proposed project.

The following paragraph on pages 8-42 and 8-43 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

While Alternative C would require the largest amount of remediation facilities, as with the proposed project, all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning would not generate substantial amounts of domestic wastewater. Because these are not wastewater-intensive facilities, it is not anticipated that this alternative would generate effluent that would exceed applicable standards or capacity, nor would the alternative require the construction of new treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the temporary continued operation, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning of the IM-3 Facility. The IM-3 Facility currently discharges nonhazardous wastewater to a 2,000-gallon tank on-site, which is removed by a wastewater disposal contractor. Because this effluent is disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and does not exceed existing treatment capacity. Nonhazardous incidental waste from construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning of IM-3 would be similar to the proposed project. Operation of Alternative C (primarily energy needed to move water through the remediation system) would require up to 2.6 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative C could potentially generate electricity on-site using natural gas-fired generators that would draw fuel from the existing gas pipeline. ~~As with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative.~~ Impacts on utilities would be similar to the proposed project.

The following paragraph on page 8-47 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

As with the proposed project, all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning for Alternative D would not generate substantial amounts of domestic wastewater. Because implementation of this alternative would not construct wastewater-intensive facilities, it is not anticipated that this alternative would generate effluent that would exceed applicable standards or capacity, nor would the alternative require the construction of new treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the temporary continued operation, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning of the IM-3 Facility. The IM-3 Facility currently discharges nonhazardous wastewater to a 2,000-gallon tank on-site, which is removed by a wastewater disposal contractor. Because this effluent is disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and does not exceed existing treatment capacity. Nonhazardous incidental waste from construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning of IM-3 would be similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, it is expected that a permitted municipal solid waste facility within a 200 miles of the project site would accommodate the nonhazardous waste. Operation of Alternative D (primarily energy needed to move water through the remediation system) would require up to 2.6 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative D could potentially generate electricity on-site using natural gas-fired generators that would draw fuel from the existing gas pipeline. ~~However, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative.~~ Impacts on utilities would be similar to the proposed project.

The following paragraph on pages 8-51 and 8-52 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

As with the proposed project, all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning for Alternative F would not generate substantial amounts of domestic wastewater. Because implementation of this alternative would not construct wastewater-intensive facilities, it is not anticipated that this alternative would generate effluent that would exceed applicable standards or capacity, nor would the alternative require the construction of new treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the temporary continued operation, maintenance of the IM-3 Facility during construction of the Alternative. Alternative F would include an approximately 90,000 square-foot treatment plant, which would eventually be decommissioned. Like the IM-3 Facility, it is expected that the new treatment plant would discharge nonhazardous wastewater to a tank on-site, which would be removed by a wastewater disposal

contractor. Because this effluent would be disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and would not exceed existing treatment capacity. Nonhazardous incidental waste from construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning of IM-3, and the new treatment plant would be similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, it is expected that a permitted municipal solid waste facility within a 200 miles of the project site would accommodate the nonhazardous waste. Operation of Alternative F (primarily energy needed to move water through the remediation system) would require up to ~~11~~ 11 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative F could potentially generate electricity on-site using natural gas-fired generators that would draw fuel from the existing gas pipeline. ~~However, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative. Impacts on utilities would be similar to the proposed project. Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in estimate energy use.~~

The following paragraph on page 8-56 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

As with the proposed project, all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning for Alternative G would not generate substantial amounts of domestic wastewater. Because implementation of this alternative would not construct wastewater-intensive facilities, it is not anticipated that this alternative would generate effluent that would exceed applicable standards or capacity, nor would the alternative require the construction of new treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the temporary continued operation, maintenance of the IM-3 Facility during construction of the Alternative. Alternative G would decommission and demolish the current IM-3 Facility after constructing an approximately 90,000 square-foot treatment plant, which would eventually be decommissioned. Like the IM-3 Facility, it is expected that the new treatment plant would discharge nonhazardous wastewater to a tank on-site, which would be removed by a wastewater disposal contractor. Because this effluent would be disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and would not exceed existing treatment capacity. Nonhazardous incidental waste from construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning of IM-3, and the new treatment plant would be similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, it is expected that a permitted municipal solid waste facility within a 200 miles of the project site would accommodate the nonhazardous waste. Operation of Alternative G (primarily energy needed to move water through the remediation system) would require up to 11

million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative G could potentially generate electricity on-site using natural gas-fired generators that would draw fuel from the existing gas pipeline. ~~However, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative.~~ Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in estimate energy use.

The following paragraph on pages 8-60 and 8-61 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

As with the proposed project, all phases of construction, operation, and decommissioning for Alternative H would not generate substantial amounts of domestic wastewater. Because implementation of this alternative would not construct wastewater-intensive facilities, it is not anticipated that this alternative would generate effluent that would exceed applicable standards or capacity, nor would the alternative require the construction of new treatment facilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would also require the temporary continued operation, maintenance of the IM-3 Facility during construction of the Alternative. Alternative H would then decommission and demolish the current IM-3 Facility and construct an approximately 55,000 square-foot treatment plant, which would eventually be decommissioned. Like the IM-3 Facility, it is expected that the new treatment plant would discharge nonhazardous wastewater to a tank on-site, which would be removed by a wastewater disposal contractor. Because this effluent would be disposed of by the wastewater contractor and handled consistent with applicable requirements and regulations, it is assumed that it would not exceed applicable water treatment standards and would not exceed existing treatment capacity. Nonhazardous incidental waste from construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning of IM-3, and the new treatment plant would be similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, it is expected that a permitted municipal solid waste facility within a 200 miles of the project site would accommodate the nonhazardous waste. Operation of Alternative H (primarily energy needed to move water through the remediation system) would require up to 7.6 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative ~~G~~ H could potentially generate electricity on-site using natural gas-fired generators that would draw fuel from the existing gas pipeline. ~~However, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative.~~ Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project due to the substantial increase in estimate energy use.

The following paragraph on page 8-64 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

Alternative I would not result in a change to existing operations of the IM-3 Facility, which currently discharges nonhazardous wastewater to a 2,000-gallon tank on-site. The impact on wastewater facilities would be negligible. Hazardous and nonhazardous wastes (sludge and brine, respectively) would continue to require off-site disposal that would not be required by the proposed project. Energy demands required by the continued operation of IM-3 (1.8 million kilowatt hours per year) would be slightly greater than that required by the proposed project (1.6 million kilowatt hours per year). The City has stated that the existing electrical line would not be able to accommodate up to 1.6 million kilowatt-hours, and it is likely that upgrades to the electrical system would be required for Alternative I as they are for the proposed project (Impact UTIL-1). ~~However, as with the proposed project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 would ensure sufficient energy supplies would be available for the alternative.~~ Impacts on utilities would be fewer in the short-term, but greater than under the proposed project due to the substantial increase in estimate energy use and required off-site disposal of hazardous and nonhazardous byproducts that would be generated. The overall impact on utilities would be greater when compared to the proposed project.

Table 8-3 on page 8-70 of the FEIR is hereby revised as follows to reflect this new information:

<p align="center">Table 8-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts by Project Alternative</p>								
Resource	Proposed Project	Alternative B Monitored Natural Attenuation	Alternative C High Volume In Situ Treatment	Alternative D Sequential In Situ Treatment	Alternative F Pump and Treat	Alternative G Combined Floodplain In Situ/Pump and Treat	Alternative H Combined Upland In Situ/Pump and Treat	No Project Alternative/Alternative I Continued Operation of Interim Measure
Utilities & Service Systems	<u>PS/LTS</u>	Less demand on energy facilities therefore fewer impacts than the proposed project.	Alternative C would require more energy than the proposed project; however, proposed mitigation measures would be the same. Impacts on utilities would be similar to the proposed project.	Alternative D would require more energy than the proposed project; however, proposed mitigation measures would be the same. Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in estimate energy use.	Alternative F would require more energy than the proposed project; however, proposed mitigation measures would be the same. Impacts on utilities would be similar to the proposed project.	Alternative G would require more energy than the proposed project; however, proposed mitigation measures would be the same. Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in estimate energy use.	Alternative H would require more energy than the proposed project; however, proposed mitigation measures would be the same. Impacts on utilities would be greater than under the proposed project because of the substantial increase in estimate energy use.	Energy demands required by the continued operation of IM-3 would be slightly greater than that required by the proposed project. However, upgrades to the electrical system would likely also be required, therefore impacts would be similar to the proposed project.
<p>Notes: LTS = Less than significant; PS = potentially significant, mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level; SU = Significant and unavoidable. * For each environmental issue, the alternative is compared to the project based on the level of severity of impacts (i.e., greater, less, and similar). Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2010</p>								

Revisions to Section 6.4.4 (Cultural Resources) of the FEIR

It has come to the DTSC's attention that the numbering of the revised mitigation measures in the Cultural Resources Section of the FEIR (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 4.4) were unintentionally not updated in the FEIR's revisions to the Cumulative Impacts Section (FEIR, Volume 2, Section 6.4.4, p. 6-33.)

Therefore, the following two paragraphs on page 6-33 of the FEIR are hereby revised as follows:

Implementation of the proposed project has the potential to impact known and unknown cultural resources as well as known and unknown unique archeological resources, during construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning activities. Potential cultural resource impacts could occur to the Topock Cultural Area, some of the approximately 80 identified cultural resources in the project area, and to as-yet-unidentified resources that may exist in unsurveyed areas or in buried contexts. These impacts are considered significant and unavoidable (Topock Cultural Area) or potentially significant (other identified and as yet undiscovered historical resources). Mitigation would reduce impacts through avoidance, monitoring, and standard treatment options for most cultural resources (~~Mitigation Measures CUL-1a, 1b, and 1e and CUL-2~~ CUL-1a-1 through 13, Mitigation Measures CUL-1b/c -1 through CUL-1b/c -4, and Mitigation Measures CUL-2). However, even with the implementation of mitigation such as provision of access to the tribes and use of previously disturbed areas and existing physical improvements, significant impacts to the Topock Cultural Area and other historical resources within the project area are expected to be significant and unavoidable. As such, the proposed project contributes to this significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

For purposes of this cumulative impact analysis the Topock Cultural Area is considered at the local scale as described above. Project-related impacts on this resource can be reduced through implementation of ~~Mitigation Measures CUL-1a, 1b, and 1e and CUL-2~~ CUL-1a-1 through 13, Mitigation Measures CUL-1b/c -1 through CUL-1b/c -4, and Mitigation Measures CUL-2, but, as discussed in Section 4.4, cannot be fully mitigated due to the unique characteristics of this historical resource. The Topock Cultural Area has been subjected to many previous impacts, including the introduction of transportation, energy, and recreational facilities, as well as through construction of the IM-3 Facility and associated ground-disturbing activities undertaken in developing the Final Remedy.