

From: Cobrain, Dave, NMENV <dave.cobrain@state.nm.us>

Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:16 AM

To: Address, Lane, NMENV <Lane.Address@state.nm.us>; Wear, Benjamin, NMENV <Benjamin.Wear@state.nm.us>; Suzuki, Michiya, NMENV <Michiya.Suzuki@state.nm.us>; Murphy, Robert, NMENV <Robert.Murphy@state.nm.us>

Subject: FW: KAFB BFF stuff

KAFB BFFS
ST-106/SS-111
Drilling in Source Area
HWB Assessment of Air Force
CSM Findings & Proposed
Well Locations presentation
dated 5/21/2020



ENTERED

Sid's input. We'll need to bring this up on Friday's call but I think we covered it by requiring that the Air Force drill through the clay and also call us to discuss what they observe.

From: sbrandwe <sbrandwe@q.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:10 AM

To: Cobrain, Dave, NMENV <dave.cobrain@state.nm.us>

Subject: [EXT] KAFB BFF stuff

Dave,

I must be getting bored in this isolation time. I even took a look at the NMED HWB website (for free).

I see in NMED's Work Plan for Data Gap Monitoring Well Installation KAFB-106248 to KAFB-106252, dated July 14, 2020, that you expect KAFB to recognize the difference between the upper and lower clay in the borehole(s) drilled for that purpose. Apparently, as shown in KAFB's CSM Cross Section D-D' in the slides of CSM Findings and Proposed New Well Locations, AFCEC/CZTE, dated May 21 2020, they have no clue as to what you are expecting because they only show one continuous clay and freely connect the upper and lower clay and ignore where there are both clays.

They seem to only recognize one "250 foot clay" as one continuous clay layer that has 50 foot of relief. They also mistakenly interpret steel centralizers in wells as fine-grained units [see KAFB-106001 and KAFB-106024 on D-D'] and don't recognize the difference of a unit with a minor resistivity excursion which probably is not a fine-grained unit with one with a major resistivity excursion which is a fine-grained unit. They are also really straining the imagination by making many of their "fine-grained units" so continuous, especially after so many years of hearing how nothing is continuous from them (and Dennis).

I think you need to get them to produce a believable cross-section through the expected borehole location(s) projecting the elevations of both the upper and lower clays based upon structure contour maps of the two clays that are either ones you make, ones I gave you, or ones that KAFB should make. This needs to be done before start of drilling at those locations so you would know which clays are expected at what depth, instead of KAFB interpreting anything based on their erroneous concepts.

If KAFB does not agree with the concepts of two flat-laying clays with a discontinuous section, but adheres to their concept of one continuous clay that can bounce up or down 20--50 feet, how can they tell the difference between the upper or lower clay and how will they know if one layer is missing?

KAFB5148



In the slides of CSM Findings and Proposed New Well Locations, AFCEC/CZTE, dated May 21 2020,

Aside 1. What kind of fence diagram is CSM Fence Diagram CDFG? The photo inset shows F' and G' touching, but not in the fence diagram. All profile lines in the diagram are straight. This is not a fence diagram!

Aside 2. Of course, all those pretty colored maps from AECOM are useless since both the elevation and thickness are based on connecting things which shouldn't be connected.

Aside 3. Of course, all cross-sections A through G are suspect due to the 3 things pointed out in D-D', mistaking steel centralizers for fine grained zones, connecting units that shouldn't be connected and combining real fine-grained units with fake fine-grained units (minor vs major resistivity excursions).

Aside 4. Apparently, they can tell the thickness of the clay to 0.01 foot! That's pretty incredible.

Thanks for listening,

Sid in isolation