From: Miro, Alena

To: Weaver, Crystal, EMNRD

Cc: Ferguson, Dina; Nolan, Shiver; Bratcher, Mike, EMNRD
Subject: RE: Potash Line 1002 Release date 11-7-2016
Date: Thursday, January 12, 2017 12:43:28 PM

Hi Crystal,

Below is a narrative regarding the remediation actions at the Potash Line 1002 release location. After reviewing our records, it looks like I was mistaken. There were no field activities between the sampling events of 11/2015 - 11/2016.

Excavation work began in November of 2015. The pipe was clamped for leak repair. A third party remediation consultant was on site and conducted field screening after collecting soil samples. The samples collected revealed too high of field screens to submit to the lab for analysis. At this time, the excavation was 12.5' x 8' x 4'.

Apex returned to the site in November of 2016. Upon arrival, the excavation appeared to be the same dimensions as observed during the previous field mobilizations. The third party remediation consultant guided the soil excavation subcontractors to increase the excavation size to 20' x 10' x 5'. The excavation increase was done in order to insure the exposed surface of the excavation was pulled back so that the samples were collected from a fresh soil surface, one that had not been as affected by volatilization. Confirmation samples were then collected from the walls and floor of the excavation. The top of the pipe was 3' below the ground surface. Therefore, the 4 wall confirmation samples (CS-1, CS-3, CS-4 & CS-5) were collected at a depth of 3.5' and the floor sample (CS-2) that was collected below the release point was collected at a depth of 5 ' (the same depth as the new excavation floor).

Please let me know if you have any further questions regarding this matter. Thank you,
Alena

From: Weaver, Crystal, EMNRD [mailto:Crystal.Weaver@state.nm.us]

Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 12:03 PM

To: Miro, Alena

Cc: Bratcher, Mike, EMNRD; Nolan, Shiver

Subject: RE: Potash Line 1002 Release date 11-7-2016

Hello Alena,

Thank you for chatting with me over the phone last week. It helped me a lot with getting some of the things about this one straight in my head. However, just for my understanding I am still confused on how the timeframe sequence went for the digging of the 20ft long x 5ft deep hole. Would you mind just lining out in writing how that happened cause it is hard for me to follow with the 1 year gap from 11/2015 to when samples were pulled and closure was requested in 11/2016.

In our conversation you had mentioned that the hole remained open for the majority of that gap in time. So were samples taken at the 3.5 ft. depth at the time when the hole was dug to repair the pipe? Cause I am trying to still understand how if the hole is 5ft deep all around where did the samples at 3.5ft. come from? Or was the hole dug to 3.5ft to repair the pipe and then when you all came back in 11/2016 you took samples at that depth and then continued to dig further till field screening came up clean at 5ft? My biggest dilemma is I am having a hard time understanding why dig to 5ft. if your samples were also clean at 3.5ft.? Were fresh sidewalls pulled at the time of the reexcavation?

Thanks,

Crystal Weaver

Environmental Specialist OCD – Artesia District II 811 S. 1st Street Artesia, NM 88210

Office: 575-748-1283 ext. 101

Cell: 575-840-5963 Fax: 575-748-9720

From: Nolan, Shiver [mailto:SNolan@eprod.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 11:55 AM

To: Bratcher, Mike, EMNRD mike.bratcher@state.nm.us; Weaver, Crystal, EMNRD

<<u>Crystal.Weaver@state.nm.us</u>>

Cc: Miro, Alena ammiro@eprod.com>; Ferguson, Dina diferguson@eprod.com>

Subject: Potash Line 1002 Release date 11-7-2016

Attached for your handling is the final C-141 along with the Corrective Action Report as prepared by our consultant, Apex TITAN LLC. Should you need additional information, please contact Alena Miro.

Shiver Nolan

Sr. Compliance Administrator

ourpose. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message.	