

Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV

From: KOTTKAMP, SHEEN T CTR USAF AFSOC 27 SOCES/CEIER
<sheen.kottkamp.ctr@us.af.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 12:58 PM
To: Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV
Cc: Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV; Wear, Benjamin, NMENV; Cobrain, Dave, NMENV
Subject: RE: Groundwater Monitoring-CAFB

Not a problem. Let me look into what information I have and get back with you. I'll also have our PBR contractor URS assist. They may have additional information. Sheen

-----Original Message-----

From: Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV [mailto:Gabriel.Acevedo@state.nm.us]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 12:11 PM
To: KOTTKAMP, SHEEN T CTR USAF AFSOC 27 SOCES/CEIER <sheen.kottkamp.ctr@us.af.mil>
Cc: Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV <neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us>; Wear, Benjamin, NMENV <Benjamin.Wear@state.nm.us>; Cobrain, Dave, NMENV <dave.cobrain@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: Groundwater Monitoring-CAFB

Sheen,

Thanks for the information you sent regarding current groundwater level measurements and well completion information. I do have the following questions in regards to the Table 1 data. I would like to make sure we are all on the same page with this information if it will be our new baseline moving forward.

- 1.) In the Table 1 well completion information it looks like the screen was adjusted upwards to compensate for the sump. However, I did notice a possible discrepancy in sump information given for MW-F and MW-H. An example of this is MW-F where the boring log notes a T.D. at 375'. The well screen interval is 355' to 370'. Filter sand is noted from 350 to 375'. The well completion log (Figure 2) I have does not note a sump. Could the extra 5 feet be a result of over drilling the boring? Also, there is only 15 foot of screen in the well completion log (Figure 4) for MW-H. Can you double check this information for MW-F, MW-H, MW-Na, MW-Oa, and MW-Pa?
- 2.) Can you recheck the screen interval information where it appears to have been adjusted upwards to compensate for the sump for all wells where this new information has been incorporated? As I see it at this time the sump would only result in a loss of screen at the bottom of the well where screen was previously noted or the extension of the sump in the direction of the well T.D., not an adjustment of the top of screen upwards. Can you clarify this?
- 3.) Can you provide the well completion record information for monitoring wells MW-Na, Oa, and Pa? These records were not provided in the November 2015 Biennial Groundwater Monitoring Report (Appendix F).
- 4.) I am also seeing a 15 foot discrepancy between the top of the screen for MW-V, W, and X between Table 1 and 2. I concur with the 5 foot sump on these wells. Also, the well record and November 2015 Groundwater Monitoring Report sample records for MW-V and MW-W indicate a well screen length of 60 feet. Can you double check the Table 1 information provided or clarify this for me?
- 5.) It looks like there are discrepancies between the monitor well records and Table 1 well completion information for some of the wells. A good example of this is MW-A. The top of the screen in the well construction log is documented as 328' and the bottom is noted as 343'. Is this a result of the new top of casing and/or survey information or any other new information collected?

6.) Do you have any information in regards to surrounding irrigation water wells, any new calculations for average drop in water table over time, and area irrigation well pumping conditions that may affect any new monitoring wells at SWMU 113? Also, do you have general information on where the top of the Dockum begins in the area?

7.) Beyond the well record, was there any other investigation of the 40 foot sumps on MW-S, T, and U?

8.) Can you take a look at the available well information and see if the pumps are set within the screened intervals? It is looking like some of the pumps are not set within the screened interval or are set just barely below the screen. I am seeing this for monitoring wells MW-B, C, D, E, F, G. There is no data for MW-Na. Having the pumps set within the screen interval is key to low flow sampling properly. I understand the priority is to get the well situation at SWMU 113 resolved. However, if this is the case it will need to be considered for the wells that are scheduled for sampling in the future. Is there any recent data for this if you have already addressed this?

Gabriel Acevedo-HWB

-----Original Message-----

From: KOTTKAMP, SHEEN T CTR USAF AFSOC 27 SOCES/CEIER [mailto:sheen.kottkamp.ctr@us.af.mil]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 11:01 AM
To: Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV
Subject: RE: Groundwater Monitoring

Thanks. Apologies for the delay, always busy on Monday mornings. See attached spreadsheet "Monitoring Well Construction Details 2016" showing groundwater static water elevations obtained in April for all 18 monitoring wells in the program. During our preparations to develop a scope of work to rehabilitate (brush and bail) the referenced wells S, T, and U; we wanted objective confirmation of the location of the screened intervals within the wells, that information was lacking in the installation admin record. We recently received information from the USGS that indicate the respective wells have 40' sumps below the screened interval (see attached). The historic data previously indicated the wells were screened from the bottom of the wells. The USGS actually installed the wells in 1998. The recently acquired data explains why we could not reach stabilization in the wells during the sampling effort. The attached Table 1 represents the revised data based on this new information. The idea was to perforate the wells as the water level declined; however, this approach is not feasible as the wells are constructed of 4" Sch 80 PVC. Sheen

-----Original Message-----

From: Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV [mailto:Gabriel.Acevedo@state.nm.us]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 4:59 PM
To: KOTTKAMP, SHEEN T CTR USAF AFSOC 27 SOCES/CEIER <sheen.kottkamp.ctr@us.af.mil>
Subject: RE: Groundwater Monitoring

Sheen,

I am working on the Work Plan for SWMU 107/FT008. I got pulled away from it this week by a couple of other things. After the extension approval for the other well replacements, I was thinking we should consider the groundwater conditions at that time before moving ahead. It looks like things are changing faster than expected. Can you send me the current measurements for groundwater for all the site wells where data was recently collected? I will need to get my thoughts together on this and talk to my management. We can set up a conference call after that. Hope your weekend goes well.

-----Original Message-----

From: KOTTKAMP, SHEEN T CTR USAF AFSOC 27 SOCES/CEIER [mailto:sheen.kottkamp.ctr@us.af.mil]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 4:27 PM
To: Acevedo, Gabriel, NMENV
Subject: Groundwater Monitoring

Good afternoon Gabe, hope all is well with you. Last we spoke I was going to have monitoring wells S, T, and U redeveloped/rehabilitated as we were unable to sample these three wells during the recent 2016 Spring sampling event. I thought the problem was encrustation/biofouling but have discovered the issue is the groundwater static water level has now fallen below the screened interval in these wells. The wells are important to the GWM program here at Cannon due to their association with Cell 3 in Landfill #5/SWMU 113 and will have to be replaced. An additional three wells that will require replacement. We would like to set up a teleconference call with you and your leadership to discuss the groundwater monitoring program here at Cannon and replacement well construction as the water level continues to decline throughout our area. In addition, we can discuss any other issues of importance regarding Restoration here at Cannon. I would like to bring in our contractor FPM and URS into the discussion as well. Let me know what would work for everyone and we will work to arrange a date and time. Lastly, I was curious about the status of the "Supplemental RFI Work Plan for SWMU 107/FT008". I'm looking forward to executing the fieldwork and effectively delineating this site. Enjoy the weekend. Sheen

Sheen Thomas Kottkamp M.S.
Environmental Program Manager/Scientist
AGEISS Inc.
27 SOCES/CEIER
Bldg. 102
402 S. Chindit Blvd.
Cannon AFB/ NM 88103-5003
Office: 575-904-6743
Cell: 806-463-0811