Table 2. Ability of Scenarios to Minimize Environmental Effects.

RESOURCE*	SCENARIO #1	SCENARIO #2	SCENARIO #3	SCENARIO #4	SCENARIO #5
Geology and Soils	○	○	●	●	●
Surface Water	○	◪	●	●	●
Vegetation	○	●	◪	●	●
Wetlands	○	◪	●	●	●
Wildlife	○	◪	◪	●	●
Visual Conditions	○	◪	◪	●	●
Air Quality	●	○	◪	○	○
Farmlands	○	○	○	○	●
Recreation and Trails	○	●	◪	●	●
Cultural Resources	●	●	◪	◪	◪

○=poor ability ◪ =moderate ability ● =good ability

* Because Groundwater and Threatened and Endangered Species were not affected, they are not included in this table.

CONCLUSION

Scenarios #4 and #5 appear to be the best overall remediation strategies. The only difference between these two strategies is Scenario #4 would leave covered approximately 4 hectares (10 acres) of Statewide Important Farmlands that would become available for farming by the removal of all waste material under Scenario #5. However, because this area was not farmed prior to the disposal of soil, and would not likely be farmed in the future, there is no practical difference between the effects of the two scenarios. Also, it is assumed that implementation of Scenario #5 implies that a suitable waste disposal area is located that would comply with Standard Specification 104.18.

For those scenarios that have the potential to disturb the natural subsurface below disposed soils (Scenarios #3, #4, and #5), both pre-excavation subsurface testing and monitoring during excavation are highly recommended to avoid damaging subsurface archaeological resources. It is also recommended that the upper 50 cm (20 in) of disposed soil be left in place to buffer cultural resources located in the upper layers of the underlying natural soils.