

From: Andrews, David
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2008 9:52 AM
To: Spray, Karen; Baldwin, Debbie; Canfield, Chris
Cc: Gintautas, Peter
Subject: RE: URS Workplan review & Comment
My thoughts:

Overall, I think URS will need a larger area of investigation, possibly with multi-level wells. With large topographic changes in the area, we could be dealing with significant vertical flow components. Let's keep it in mind for Phase 2.

The CDWR database entry for the Prather spring indicates:

- Total Depth 120'
- Static Level 54'
- Pump Install Date – two entries 12/11/2001 and 9/1/1004

Based on CDWR's data, URS's contention that it is really a well and not a spring may be accurate. However, the CDWR database only had two scanned images in the permit phase (no scanned documents with as-built conditions), so I couldn't verify this information quickly.

The decontamination language for the augers is inconsistent. First, URS indicates that only the lead auger would be decontaminated between locations. Later, they indicate that decontaminated augers will be used for each location. Personally, I am uncomfortable with decontaminating the lead auger only, particularly when they are moving from downgradient locations to upgradient locations. It wouldn't take that much more decon water to clean all of the augers with a pressure washer between locations.

Should we have URS provide the location coordinates in NAD 83 as opposed to UTM?

David D. Andrews, P.E., P.G.
Engineering Supervisor - Northeast Area

State of Colorado
Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 801
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: (303) 894-2100 Ext. 145
Fax: (303) 894-2109
E-mail: David.Andrews@state.co.us
Website: <http://www.oil-gas.state.co.us/>

From: Spray, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 5:38 PM
To: Baldwin, Debbie; Canfield, Chris

Cc: Gintautas, Peter; Andrews, David
Subject: URS Workplan review & Comment
Importance: High

In general, they can probably go ahead and start the field work as I don't find any fatal flaws in it. I have inserted Peter's language on laboratory and soil sampling issues. It's a pretty loose document – see the URSWorkplanComments7-8-08 for non-text specific concerns such as where is the monitoring plan and please include existing sample points in the monitoring plan.

I mentioned to Debbie that I thought a soil gas survey could possibly be a useful screening tool as the gw is alleged to be shallow and VOCs are our COCs. If not downgradient by the Prather spring, then PDC could use one around the goo-pits that Marathon found when rummaging around on the pad. It might at least point us in a general direction and potentially confirm that this pad is a source.

Just some thoughts. They are going to probably have trouble using a hollow-stem auger up there and their well completions could be very shallow if they do find water on the hillslopes. Based on what Chris was describing about weather-related detections, it is always possible that we are seeing true slugs of contaminants working their way along a bedrock interface. If a well is dry, it should be left open and checked periodically to see if a slug moves into it. Also, it may not be just in the colluvium/alluvium and deeper exploration may be necessary in fractured bedrock to find it. I haven't seen the layout, but would tracer tests be viable here too?

Karen

Karen L. Spray, PG
SW Environmental Protection Specialist
Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission
P.O. Box 2651
Durango, CO 81302-2651
970-259-1619
970-259-9128 (fax)
970-903-1242 (cell)
karen.spray@state.co.us
www.cogcc.state.co.us

P *please consider the environment before printing this email*