

From: Adam Bingham <bingham@svminerals.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 12:52 PM

To: Heather Steele <heathers@stetsonengineers.com>; Jean Moran <jeanm@stetsonengineers.com>; Jeff Helsley <jeffh@stetsonengineers.com>; Steve Johnson <stevej@stetsonengineers.com>

Subject: GSP Draft Section 3 Figures comments.

Here are some comments on the Draft Section 3 figures. NOTE: Maybe put Figure Titles on the top of the Map Outline on all figures. Is this simply portrait vs. landscape setup? Plus some of the Maps are slightly shifted right of the Title rectangle- not in-line with each other.

Fig 3-1: The IWV GSA shapefile (black polygon line). Is the name correct? Is this the quaternary alluvium location? Some of it is black and the southern El Paso location is grey.

Fig 3-2: Is it helpful to show some pumpage wells in the Ridgecrest area? It appears only Inyokern area is pumping water in the valley. Do we need to put any subsurface flow arrows on the far right cross-section zone showing flow is also moving from north to south? Perhaps shift the Salt Wells Valley name and arrow slightly to the south corner to show sub surface flow from the north.

Fig 3-3: Figure label is in a different location on the top of the map instead of the side of the lower rectangle title. The Military Installation poly is above the other line shapefiles in the legend but difficult to see on the map as it is mostly covered by the GSA shapefile. Do we need to be zoomed out at this level to show Freemont Valley Watershed? Is this indicative of subsurface flow from IWV into Fremont? Also, the Data Not Available soil area is dark grey, covering the majority of the IWV and it appears we have no data in the watershed. The watershed shapefile makes it look like the IWV watershed is not fully shown. The zones to the east are watershed boundaries for Salt Valley and Searles Valley. Is this confusing?

Report Section 3.3 starts with Hydrogeological Conception Modeling but then there is a quick mention of soils with a quick shift to geology. This may be a bit confusing as well with the modeling being mentioned before the geology. Geology/surface sediments and soil resulting from hydrology impact within the watershed may be easier to understand before the modeling is mentioned. Perhaps rename the 3-3 section as the Basin Geology and Hydrology Information with all of the physical data and information that is used within the Hydrogeology Conceptual Modeling that could be 3-4 section. The Figures can link as 3-3a,b,c,d etc for the geology/surface sediments, hydrology/watershed and then 3-4a,b,c...for the conceptual modeling portions developed from the combined hydrogeological physical data. Figure names are your choice of course.

Fig 3-4a: Consider showing the Geology Maps before the Soil Map.

Figs 3-5 are geology based and then 3-6 is aquifer testing. Is it standard/common to list the hydrogeo related information before the hydro (precip/stream gauge) map/data info?

Fig 3-7: The RAWS points are hidden a bit. Perhaps change them to an orange/brown cover so they are easier to see from the precip color. Haiwee is difficult to see as it looks like the aqueduct. Gages say Brown. What is the Brown?

Fig 3-8: Title is a bit confusing. "From Mean"? Perhaps place a comma of Mean and then state 'Data from Stations Near...'

Fig 3-9: Perhaps say 'Daily Discharge Hydrograph at...'. What is Brown?- Road? Should the Gage be listed followed by 'Near Brown Road' (if it is the road) then the date?

Fig 3-10: Should this state 'Mountain Front Springs and Recharge Zones'? Perhaps change the Sierra Nevada S by adding 'Zone'. Just a thought. Also, the dashed watershed line now says Indian Wells-Searles Valley Watershed. They are separate watersheds and there are seeps or springs shown within Searles Valley that indicate surface water flows outside of the IWV and do not impact or recharge the IWV basin. Is the IWVGB line supposed to indicate or be combined with the Searles Valley GB?

Fig 3- 11,12,13: Smaller format- 11x17? Are there any wells closer to the Sierras/Inyokern that have arsenic data that can be reported?

Fig 3-14: This legend shows the Bulletin 118 Groundwater Basin in a different name and manner than the others. There appears to be Legend items with flora that are not present on the map or in the IWV. Should we be showing a large amount of ecosystem data in watersheds and basins outside and south/downstream lower elevation than IWV i.e. the Fremont and Cantil areas that also contain USGS gauges. Spelling is guage; a measurement device. Also Grapevine and Sand Canyon stream gauge items are colored differently and not listed on the Legend items. From what I know, they are not USGS gauges.

Fig 3-15: Legend- Over-*precicted* spelling. Cannot see almost any of NAWS Boundary.

Ok, I'll stop on this for ya!

Adam Bingham
Hydrogeologist
Searles Valley Minerals
13200 Main St., Trona, CA 93562
P.O. Box 367, Trona, CA 93592-0367
Wk: (760) 372-2515
bingham@svminerals.com