

**2RF – 149**

**Eddy State Water Treatment  
and Reuse Facility  
Application  
Volume 3**

**Solaris Water  
Midstream LLC  
July 21, 2020**

April 2020

## **VOLUME 3**

### **VARIANCES FOR C-147 REGISTRATION PACKAGE**

#### **SOLARIS EDDY STATE CONTAINMENTS**

- **Variances for Recycling Storage Containments**
- **Engineering Variances for AST Storage Containments**
- **Applicability of Engineering Variances to Variety of Site Conditions in Permian Basin**



*Fold in an outcrop of the Gatuña Formation near the Pecos River. This outcrop is approximately 2.64 miles east of the site for the Eddy State Recycling Facility.*

#### **Prepared for:**

**Solaris Water Midstream LLC  
9811 Katy Freeway Suite 900  
Houston, TX 77024**

#### **Prepared by:**

**R.T. Hicks Consultants, Ltd.  
901 Rio Grande NW, Ste F-142  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104**

## **VARIANCES AND/OR EQUIVALENCY DEMONSTRATIONS FOR RECYCLING STORAGE CONTAINMENTS**

- **Game/Chain link fencing in lieu of 4-strand barbed wire**
- **Avian Protection Plan in lieu of netting (see Vol 1 for product specs)**

## **FENCING VARIANCE FOR PRODUCED WATER CONTAINMENTS**

### **9.15.34.12 D Fencing**

#### **Statement Explaining Why the Applicant Seeks a Variance**

**The prescriptive mandates of the Rule that are the subject of this variance request are the following subsections of NMAC 9.15.34.12 D**

**D. Fencing.**

- (1)** The operator shall fence or enclose a recycling containment in a manner that deters unauthorized wildlife and human access and shall maintain the fences in good repair. The operator shall ensure that all gates associated with the fence are closed and locked when responsible personnel are not onsite.
- (2)** Recycling containments shall be fenced with a four-foot fence that has at least four strands of barbed wire evenly spaced in the interval between one foot and four feet above ground level.

**The applicant proposes use of game fence, chain link fence or other fence to deter wildlife access as prescribed by design engineer.**

Because feral pigs, javelina and deer are present in the Permian Basin of Chaves, Eddy and Lea Counties, a chain link or game fence is required in order to comply with Section 19.15.34.12 D.1 of the Rule. The specification for fencing provided in 19.15.34.12 D.2 contradicts D.1 because pigs will move beneath the lower strand of a 4-strand, 4-foot high barbed wire fence and deer will jump over. Thus, compliance with D.2 results in a violation of D.1. Compliance with D.1 is the critical component of the Rule.

#### **Demonstration That the Variance Will Provide Equal or Better Protection of Fresh Water, Public Health and the Environment**

The operator will provide for a fence to enclose the recycling containment in a manner that deters unauthorized wildlife and human access better than what is defined in the rule. The operator will employ a game fence, chain link or other fence as prescribed by the design engineer rather than a four-foot fence with interval strands, in order to better deter wildlife from passing under, through or over that barrier.

## **AVIAN PROTECTION PROGRAM FOR PRODUCED WATER CONTAINMENTS**

### **19.15.34.12 E – Netting**

#### **Statement Explaining Why the Applicant Seeks a Variance**

**The prescriptive mandates of the Rule that are the subject of this variance request are the following subsections NMAC 19.15.34.12 E**

**E. Netting.** The operator shall ensure that a recycling containment is screened, netted or otherwise protective of wildlife, including migratory birds. The operator shall on a monthly basis inspect for and, within 30 days of discovery, report the discovery of dead migratory birds or other wildlife to the appropriate wildlife agency and to the division district office in order to facilitate assessment and implementation of measures to prevent incidents from reoccurring.

**The operator proposes use of avian hazing protocol in lieu of netting for in-ground produced water storage containments.** The reason for requesting these variances has been two-fold:

1. The capital and O&M cost of the proposed hazing system is significantly less than netting, especially for very large (e.g. > 100,000 bbls total capacity) containments. Increased cost can cause operators to employ fresh water in lieu of recycling produced water where storage is essential.
2. Placement of support structures within large containments can, if the structures fall or fail, create a leak in liner system.

The operator will install and use the Bird-X Mega Blaster Pro as a primary hazing program for avian species. In addition to this sonic device, staff will routinely inspect the containment, at least monthly, for the presence of avian species and, if detected, will use a blank cartridge or shell in a handgun, starter pistol or shotgun as additional hazing. Decoys of birds of prey are placed on the game fence and other roosts around the open water to provide additional hazing.

#### **Demonstration That the Variance Will Provide Equal or Better Protection of Fresh Water, Public Health and the Environment**

This effective alternative to netting will provide an economic incentive for operators to store and utilize produced water recycling in lieu of fresh water. This system may also reduce the risk of liner damage related to netting support structures within the containments.

**VARIANCES AND/OR EQUIVALENCY DEMONSTRATIONS  
FOR ABOVE GROUND STEEL TANK MODULAR RECYCLING  
STORAGE CONTAINMENTS**

- **Slope and Anchor Trench Variance**
- **Freeboard Variance**

## **STATEMENT EXPLAINING WHY THE APPLICANT SEEKS A VARIANCE FOR SLOPE AND ANCHOR FOR MODULAR STEEL AST CONTAINMENT**

### **Statement Explaining Why the Applicant Seeks a Variance**

**The prescriptive mandates of the Rule that are the subject of this variance request are the following subsections of NMAC 19.15.34.12.**

**NMAC 19.15.34.12 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR A RECYCLING CONTAINMENT:**

A. An operator shall design and construct a recycling containment in accordance with the following specifications.

(2) A recycling containment shall have a properly constructed foundation and interior slopes consisting of a firm, unyielding base, smooth and free of rocks, debris, sharp edges or irregularities to prevent the liner's rupture or tear. Geotextile is required under the liner when needed to reduce localized stress-strain or protuberances that otherwise may compromise the liner's integrity. *The operator shall construct the containment in a levee with an inside grade no steeper than two horizontal feet to one vertical foot (2H:1V). The levee shall have an outside grade no steeper than three horizontal feet to one vertical foot (3H:1V).* The top of the levee shall be wide enough to install an anchor trench and provide adequate room for inspection and maintenance.

(3) Each recycling containment shall incorporate, at a minimum, a primary (upper) liner and a secondary (lower) liner with a leak detection system appropriate to the site's conditions. *The edges of all liners shall be anchored in the bottom of a compacted earth-filled trench. The anchor trench shall be at least 18 inches deep.*

**The applicant requests a variance to prescribed slope and anchor in the setting of above ground modular steel containments.**

With respect to storage of produced water for use in lieu of fresh water, Rule 34 is written for earthen, lined pits, not free-standing modular impoundments that employ liners as their primary fluid containment system. A modular impoundment consists of a professionally designed steel tank ring with vertical walls. There is no slope to consider as the segmental steel sections are set vertical.

There is no anchor trench as envisioned by the Rule, liners are anchored to the top of the steel walls with clips, no anchor trench is required.

**Demonstration That the Variance Will Provide Equal or Better Protection of Fresh Water, Public Health and the Environment**

The following technical memorandum provides supportive data to demonstrate equal or better protection of fresh water, public health and the environment by providing the requisite containment and protection.

**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

**Technical Memorandum: Slope and Anchor Trench Variance for Above Ground Steel Modular Containments**

**NMAC 19.15.34.12 A (2), (3)**

**Side Slope**

The design of soil side slope (inclination) is a geotechnical engineering design consideration. Liquid impoundments such as fresh water or process water containments are usually built within an excavation or with raised earthen embankments. For a liquid impoundment with an exposed liner system, the slope soils and construction dictate slope inclination and very detailed slope stability analysis may be required to determine if slope failure within the embankment will occur once loaded with impounded water. Slope failure may also occur during construction or when the impoundment is empty. A maximum slope is usually specified and is dependent on soil type and cohesive strength, saturated or unsaturated conditions, etc. Detailed analysis for slope stability can be found in "Designing with Geosynthetics" by R.M Koerner as well as many geotechnical books.

A modular impoundment, on the other hand, consists of a professionally designed steel tank ring with vertical walls. *There is no slope to consider as the segmental steel sections are set vertical.* Design of steel tanks, in regard to hydrostatic loading, wind loading, seismic loads, etc. are thoroughly referenced with detailed procedures in the design code - American Petroleum Institute (API) 650-98 "Welded Steel Tanks for Oil Storage". *There are no requirements for maximum slope inclination other than perhaps 90 degrees or vertical wall.*

**Anchor Trench**

All earthen impoundments with a geomembrane lining system require some form of top of slope anchor, the most common of which is an excavated and backfilled anchor trench usually set back at least 3 ft from the top of slope. Again, there are detailed procedures for anchor trench design in "Designing with Geosynthetics" by R.M Koerner.

*A Modular Impoundment requires mechanical anchoring of the geomembrane at the top of the vertical steel wall using standard liner clips that prevent the geomembrane or geomembrane layers from slipping down the side wall.* These are detailed in the Tank Installation Manual. *There are no requirements for an "anchor trench" as this is not an in-ground impoundment.*

*In summary, based on the design and specifications of a modular steel impoundment, there is no requirement for a maximum interior slope angle of 2H:1V due to the fact that this impoundment is a steel tank with vertical walls. Additionally, there is no requirement for an anchor trench as the geomembrane is attached to the top of the Modular Impoundment vertical walls with large steel clips.* This provides the requisite protection of fresh water, public health and the environment for many years.



**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

If you have any questions on the above technical memorandum or require further information, give me a call at 303-679-0285 or email [geosynthetics@msn.com](mailto:geosynthetics@msn.com)

Sincerely Yours,

*R K Frobel*

Ronald K. Frobel, MSCE, PE



**References:**

NMAC 19.15.34.12 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR A RECYCLING CONTAINMENT

American Petroleum Institute (API) 650-98 "Welded Steel Tanks for Oil Storage"

Koerner, R.M., 2005 "Designing With Geosynthetics" Prentice Hall Publishers

**Attachments:**

R. K. Frobel C.V.

**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

**Freeboard Requirements for Above Ground Steel Tank Modular  
Recycling Storage Containments**  
**NMAC 19.15.34.13 B (2)**

Liquid impoundments such as fresh water or process water containments are usually built within an excavation or with raised earthen embankments. For a liquid impoundment with an exposed liner system, the slope soils and construction dictate slope inclination and very detailed slope stability analysis may be required to determine if slope failure within the embankment will occur once loaded with impounded water. Freeboard or the vertical height between the maximum water surface elevation and the top of slope is important for earthen impoundments. Specified freeboard requirements take into consideration high precipitation events and prevent wave run-up on slopes that result in over-topping and potential saturation of embankments. This is particularly important on large earthen impoundments. Detailed design considerations including freeboard requirements for lined earthen impoundments can be found in "Designing with Geosynthetics" by R.M Koerner as well as other publications on reservoir design.

A modular impoundment, on the other hand, consists of a professionally designed steel tank ring with vertical walls. There is no slope to consider as the segmental steel sections are set vertical. Design of steel tanks as regards hydrostatic loading, wind loading, seismic loads, etc. are thoroughly referenced with detailed procedures in the design code - American Petroleum Institute (API) 650-98 "Welded Steel Tanks for Oil Storage". *There are requirements for operational freeboard to prevent over-topping but due to the relatively small surface area and fetch of cylindrical tanks, wave heights are much less than large earthen impoundments. Thus, freeboard is usually within the range of 0.5 to 2 ft.* I have reviewed the Tank Design Calculation Summary and regarding the structural stability of the tank walls, a freeboard of 0.5 ft was assumed. Thus, the variance request of 2.0 ft for a Modular Impoundment is well within the Tank Design requirements.

*In summary, it is my professional opinion that the design freeboard of 2.0 ft will provide requisite storage volume and prevent overtopping due to wind and wave action, potential seismic events and high precipitation.*

If you have any questions on the above technical memorandum or require further information, give me a call at 303-679-0285 or email [geosynthetics@msn.com](mailto:geosynthetics@msn.com)

Sincerely Yours,

*R K Frobel*

Ronald K. Frobel, MSCE, PE

**References:**

NMAC 19.15.34.13 OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR RECYCLING CONTAINMENTS



***R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES***  
***Consulting Engineers***

American Petroleum Institute (API) 650-98 “Welded Steel Tanks for Oil Storage”

Koerner, R.M., 2005 “Designing With Geosynthetics” Prentice Hall Publishers

Attachments:

R. K. Frobel C.V.

The modular impoundment is designed for use with fluids that are 8.34 pounds/gallon (62.4 pounds per cubic foot) or lighter. Exceeding this specification for fluid weight at full tank capacity (12') could lead to failure at the connection plate(s).

Assuming a freeboard of 0.5 ft (minimum modular impoundment freeboard requirement) the Hydro Pressure (p) of water is 718 pounds per square foot (psf), where

$$\begin{aligned}
 p &= \text{Design Density} \times \text{Height} \\
 &= 62.4 \text{ PCF} \times 11.5 \text{ ft} \\
 (\text{design density} &= 8.34 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{gal}} \times 7.48 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{gal}})
 \end{aligned}$$

The density of the conditioned produced water is 9.3 pounds/gallon. Assuming a freeboard of 3-ft (19.15.17.12.F(3) NMAC) , the Hydro Pressure (p) of conditioned produced water is 626 psf, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 p &= \text{Design Density} \times \text{Height} \\
 &= 69.64 \text{ PCF} \times 9 \text{ ft} \\
 (\text{design density} &= 9.3 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{gal}} \times 7.48 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{gal}})
 \end{aligned}$$

Using conditioned produced water with the Pit Rule freeboard requirements of 3-feet results in a Hydro Pressure 92 psf less than the engineered design.

The operator asks the District Division to allow for a 2-foot freeboard, which yields a Hydro Pressure (p) of 696.4 psf, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 p &= \text{Design Density} \times \text{Height} \\
 &= 69.64 \text{ PCF} \times 10 \text{ ft} \\
 (\text{design density} &= 9.3 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{gal}} \times 7.48 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{gal}})
 \end{aligned}$$

**VARIANCES AND/OR EQUIVALENCY DEMONSTRATIONS  
FOR IN-GROUND RECYCLING STORAGE CONTAINMENTS  
SECONDARY LINERS**

***40-mil HDPE liner for secondary liner – Equivalency to 30-mil LLDPEr***

## **STATEMENT EXPLAINING WHY THE APPLICANT SEEKS A VARIANCE FOR 40 MIL HDPE LINER AS AN ALTERNATIVE SECONDARY LINER FOR IN GROUND RECYCLING CONTAINMENT**

### **Statement Explaining Why the Applicant Seeks Variance**

**The prescriptive mandates of the Rule that are the subject of this variance request are the following subsections of 19.15.34.12**

**NMAC 19.15.34.12 A. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR A RECYCLING CONTAINMENT**

**(4)** All primary (upper) liners in a recycling containment shall be geomembrane liners composed of an impervious, synthetic material that is resistant to ultraviolet light, petroleum hydrocarbons, salts and acidic and alkaline solutions. All primary liners shall be 30-mil flexible PVC, 45-mil LLDPE string reinforced or 60-mil HDPE liners. *Secondary liners shall be 30-mil LLDPE string reinforced or equivalent with a hydraulic conductivity no greater than  $1 \times 10^{-9}$  cm/sec.* Liner compatibility shall meet or exceed the EPA SW-846 method 9090A or subsequent relevant publications.

**The applicant is requesting a variance for the use of proposed 40-mil HDPE as a secondary liner in place of the 30-mil LLDPE string reinforced liner recommended in Rule 34.**

The 40 mil HDPE liner is more available, more cost effective and is easier to field seam than the recommended 30 mil LLDPE string reinforced liner material, while providing an equivalent performance and protection in the setting of appropriate site preparation, a primary liner of 60 mil HDPE material and appropriate drainage layers.

### **Demonstration That the Variance Will Provide Equal or Better Protection of Fresh Water, Public Health and the Environment**

The following technical documents provide supportive data to demonstrate equal or better protection of fresh water, public health and the environment by providing the requisite containment and protection. Technical comparison of the proposed material is compared to what is advised through Rule 34 is discussed. A second memorandum provides clarification that the engineering requirements for site preparation, which ensures functionality of the liner system, is crosscutting to varied locations within the Permian Basin. Siting criteria and stamped plans from design engineer confirm applicability of this liner system to this specific site.

**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

**Technical Memorandum: 40-mil HDPE as Alternative Secondary Liner System for In Ground Recycling Containment Facilities**

**NMAC 19.15.34.12 A**

I have investigated the suitability of application for 40 mil HDPE geomembrane as an equivalent secondary liner to 30 mil scrim reinforced LLDPE (LLDPEr) in the application for In Ground Recycling Containment facilities. *In summary, it is my professional opinion that the specified 40 mil HDPE geomembrane will provide a secondary liner system that is equal to or better than 30 mil scrim reinforced LLDPEr and will provide the requisite protection of fresh water, public health and the environment for many years when engineering design provides requisite site/soil/slope preparation and when used in concert with requisite primary liners and drainage layers.*

It is understood that the lining system under discussion is composed of a 60 mil HDPE Primary liner, geonet drainage layer and a 40 mil HDPE Secondary liner. *In consideration of the secondary lining system application, size of impoundment and depth, design details as well as the chemical nature of typical processed water, it is my professional opinion that the 40 mil HDPE geomembrane will provide the requisite barrier against processed water loss and will function effectively as a secondary liner.*

The following are discussion points that hopefully will exhibit the equivalency of a 40 mil HDPE secondary liner to that of a 30 mil LLDPEr.

The nature and formulation of the 40 mil HDPE resin is the same as the Primary 60 mil HDPE. The major difference is that the 40 mil HDPE is lower in thickness (more flexible and less puncture resistant). However, in covered conditions, HDPE will resist aging and degradation and remain intact for many decades. In fact, a secondary liner of 40 mil HDPE will outlast an exposed 60 mil HDPE liner. According to the Geosynthetic Research Institute (GRI) study on lifetime prediction (GRI Paper No. 6), the half life of HDPE (GRI GM 13) exposed is > 36 years and the half-life of HDPE covered or buried is greater than 100 years. It is understood that in order to ensure compliance of materials, the primary 60 mil HDPE to be used must meet or exceed GRI GM 13 Standards. Likewise, the secondary liner that is not exposed to the same environmental and chemical conditions must meet or exceed GRI GM 13 for non-reinforced HDPE. Adhering to the minimum requirements of the GRI Specifications, 40 mil HDPE when used as a secondary liner will be equally as protective as the primary 60 mil HDPE liner (reference: [www.geosynthetic-institute.org/grispecs](http://www.geosynthetic-institute.org/grispecs)) and equally as protective as a 30 mil scrim reinforced LLDPEr liner.

Durability of Geomembranes is directly affected by exposure conditions. Buried or covered geomembranes are not affected by the same degradation mechanisms (UV, Ozone, Chemical, Stress, Temperature, etc) as are fully exposed geomembranes. In this regard, the secondary liner material and thickness can be much less robust than the fully exposed primary liner which in this case is 60 mil HDPE. This is also the case for



**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

landfill lining systems where the secondary geomembrane in a bottom landfill cell may be 40 mil HDPE.

Thermal Fusion Seaming Requirements. Thermal seaming and QC seam test requirements for geomembranes are product specific and usually prescribed by the sheet manufacturer. Dual wedge thermal fusion welding is commonly used on HDPE and QC testing by air channel (ASTM D 5820) is fully acceptable and recognized as an industry standard. In this regard, there should be no exception requirement for seaming and QC testing as both the Primary and Secondary geomembranes are HDPE. This is fully covered in comprehensive specifications for both the Primary and Secondary geomembranes (Reference: [www.ASTM.org/Standards](http://www.ASTM.org/Standards)).

Potential for Leakage through the Primary and Secondary Liners. Leakage through geomembrane liners is directly a function of the height of liquid head above any hole or imperfection. The geonet drainage media provides immediate drainage to a low point or sump and thus no hydrostatic head or driving gradient is available to push leakage water through a hole in the secondary liner. In this regard, secondary geomembrane materials can be (and usually are) much less in thickness and also polymer type. Hydraulic Conductivity through the 40 mil HDPE liner material is extremely low due to the polymer type, structure and crystallinity and exceeds requirements of EPA SW-846 Method 9090A.

Chemical Attack. Chemical attack to polymeric geomembranes is directly a function of type of chemical, temperature and exposure time. Again, the HDPE Primary provides the chemically resistant liner and is QC tested to reduce potential defects or holes. If there is a small hole, the geonet drain takes any leakage water immediately to the sump for extraction. Thus, exposure time is very limited on a secondary liner in addition to low temperature, little volume and virtually no head pressure. In this regard, a chemically resistant geomembrane material such as 40 mil HDPE can be specified for the secondary and is a fully acceptable alternate to 30 mil scrim reinforced LLDPEr.

Mechanical Properties Characteristics. Geomembranes of different polymer and/or structure (i.e., reinforced vs non-reinforced) cannot be readily compared using such characteristics as tensile stress/strain, tear, puncture and polymer requirements. For a 40 mil HDPE liner material to function as a Secondary liner it should meet or exceed the manufacturers minimum requirements for Density, Tensile Properties, Tear, Puncture as well as other properties such as UV resistance. The sheet material must also meet or exceed GRI GM 13 minimum requirements. *In this regard, a 40 mil HDPE will be equivalent to a 30 mil LLDPEr as a secondary liner for the conditions listed below:*

- *The subgrade or compacted earth foundation will be smooth, free of debris or loose rocks, dry, unyielding and will support the lining system.*
- *The side slopes for the containment shall be equal to or less than 3H:1V.*
- *The physical properties and condition of the subgrade or liner foundation*

## **R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**

**Consulting Engineers**

- (i.e., density, slope, moisture) will be inspected and certified by a Professional Engineer that it meets or exceeds specification requirements.
- Immediately prior to installation, the installation contractor shall inspect and sign off on the subgrade conditions that they meet or exceed the HDPE manufacturer and installers requirements.
  - A protective geotextile will be placed on the finished and accepted subgrade between subgrade and the 40 mil HDPE Secondary liner.
  - A 200 mil geonet will be placed over the 40 mil HDPE Secondary Liner.
  - A 60 mil HDPE Primary liner will be placed over the 200 mil geonet drainage layer.

If you have any questions on the above technical memorandum or require further information, give me a call at 720-289-0300 or email [geosynthetics@msn.com](mailto:geosynthetics@msn.com)

Sincerely Yours,

*RK Frobel*

Ronald K. Frobel, MSCE, PE



References:

NMAC 19.15.34.12 A DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR A RECYCLING CONTAINMENT

Geosynthetic Research Institute (GRI) Published Standards and Papers 2017  
[www.geosynthetic-institute.org](http://www.geosynthetic-institute.org)

ASTM Geosynthetics' Standards 2017  
[www.ASTM.org/Standards](http://www.ASTM.org/Standards)

**APPLICABILITY OF VARIANCES FOR RECYCLING  
CONTAINMENTS IN THE PERMIAN BASIN OF NEW  
MEXICO**

**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

**Technical Memorandum: Applicability of Variances for In Ground Lined Containments in the Permian Basin of New Mexico**  
NMAC 19.15.34.12 A (2)

I have reviewed the historical variances for In Ground Containments in the document titled “Variances for C-147 Registration Packages Permian Basin of New Mexico” (January 2020) and examined the applicable design drawings and permits for the following In Ground containments:

- C-147 Registration Package for Gamma Ridge Recycling Containment and Recycling Facility, Section 14, T24-S, R34-E, Lea County
- C-147 Registration Package for Dagger 2 Recycling Containment and Recycling Facility, Section 30, T21-S, R33-E, Lea County
- C-147 Registration Package for Landes Recycling Containment and Recycling Facility, Section 22, T25-S, T28-E, Eddy County
- C-147 Registration Package for Fez Recycling Containment and Recycling Facility Area (+ 100 acres, Section 8, T25-S, R35-E, Lea County)

Locations of the In Ground containments are in Lea and Eddy County and range from west of the Pecos River to slightly west of Jal, NM. All the locations exhibit different surface and subsurface geology, different topography and are of various sizes and volumes. *However, in regard to structural integrity of the base soils that support the geomembrane containment system, the specification requirements are the same.* The foundation soils must be roller compacted smooth and free of loose aggregate over ½ inch. Compaction characteristics must meet or exceed 95% of Standard Proctor Density in accordance with ASTM D 698. This specification requirement is specific and causes the general or earthworks contractor to meet this standard regardless of the site specific geology or topography. Provided that the design drawings and associated specifications call out the minimum requirements for subsoils compaction (i.e., 95% Standard Proctor Density – ASTM D 698), the design engineer or owners representative will carry out soils testing on the foundation materials to provide certainty to the containment owner that the earthworks contractor has met these obligations.

*Thus, provided that the contractor meets the minimum specified requirements for foundation soils preparation and density, the location, geology or depth to groundwater will make no difference in regard to geomembrane liner equivalency as demonstrated by the variances presented in this volume and are considered valid for meeting NMOCD Rule 34 requirements for all locations within the Permian Basin of New Mexico.*

If you have any questions on the above technical memorandum or require further information, give me a call at 720-289-0300 or email [geosynthetics@msn.com](mailto:geosynthetics@msn.com)

**R.K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES**  
*Consulting Engineers*

Sincerely Yours,

*R.K. Frobel*

Ronald K. Frobel, MSCE, PE

References:

NMAC 19.15.34.12 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR A  
RECYCLING CONTAINMENT

ASTM Standards 2019



**RONALD K. FROBEL, MSCE, P.E.**

**CIVIL ENGINEERING  
GEOSYNTHETICS  
EXPERT WITNESS  
FORENSICS**

**FIRM:** R. K. FROBEL & ASSOCIATES  
Consulting Civil / Geosynthetics Engineers

**TITLE:** Principal and Owner

**PROFESSIONAL**

**AFFILIATIONS:** American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) -  
Founding member of Committee D 35 on Geosynthetics  
Chairman ASTM D35 Subcommittee on Geomembranes 1985-2000  
ASTM Award of Merit Recipient/ASTM Fellow - 1992  
ASTM D18 Soil and Rock - Special Service Award - 2000  
Transportation Research Board (TRB) of The National Academies  
Appointed Member A2K07 Geosynthetics 2000 - 2003  
National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) - Member  
American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) - Member  
Colorado Section - ASCE - Member  
International Society of Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineers  
(ISSMFE) - Member  
International Geosynthetics Society (IGS) - Member  
North American Geosynthetics Society (NAGS) - Member  
International Standards Organization (ISO) - Member TC 221  
Team Leader - USA Delegation Geosynthetics 1985 - 2001  
European Committee for Standardization (CEN) - USA Observer  
EPA Advisory Committee on Geosynthetics (Past Member)  
Association of State Dam Safety Officials (ASDSO) – Member  
U. S. Committee on Irrigation and Drainage (USCID) - Member  
Technical Advisory Committee - Geosynthetics Magazine  
Editorial Board - Geotextiles and Geomembranes Journal  
Fabricated Geomembrane Institute (FGI) – Board of Directors  
Co-Chairman International Conference on Geomembranes  
Co-Chairman ASTM Symposium on Impermeable Barriers  
U.S. Naval Reserve Officer (Inactive)  
Registered Professional Engineer – Civil (Colorado)  
Mine Safety Health Administration (MSHA) Certified

**ACADEMIC**

**BACKGROUND:** University of Arizona: M.S. - Civil Engineering - 1975  
University of Arizona: B. S. - Civil Engineering – 1969  
Wentworth Institute of Technology: A.S. Architecture – 1966

**PROFESSIONAL**

**EXPERIENCE:**

R. K. Frobel & Associates - Consulting Engineers  
Evergreen, Colorado, Principal and Owner, 1988 - Present

Chemie Linz AG and Polyfelt Ges.m.b.H., Linz, Austria  
U. S. Technical Manager Geosynthetics, 1985 - 1988

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Engineering and Research Center  
Denver, Colorado, Technical Specialist in Construction  
Materials Research and Application, 1978 - 1985

Water Resources Research Center (WRRC), University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ, Associate Research Engineer, 1975 - 1978

Engineering Experiment Station, University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ, Research Assistant, 1974 - 1975

United States Navy, Commissioned Naval Officer, 1970 - 1973

**REPRESENTATIVE**

**EXPERIENCE:**

R.K. Frobel & Associates: Civil engineering firm specializing in the fields of geotechnical, geo-environmental and geosynthetics. Expertise is provided to full service civil/geotechnical engineering firms, federal agencies, municipalities or owners on a direct contract, joint venture or sub-consultant basis. Responsibilities are primarily devoted to specialized technical assistance in design and application for foreign and domestic projects such as the following:

Forensics investigations into geotechnical and geosynthetics failures; providing expert report and testimony on failure analysis; providing design and peer review on landfill lining and cover system design, mine waste reclamation, water treatment facilities, hydro-technical canal, dam, reservoir and mining projects, floating reservoir covers; oil and gas waste containment; design of manufacturers technical literature and manuals; development and presentation of technical seminars; new product development and testing; MQA/CQA program design and implementation.

Polyfelt Ges.m.b.H., Linz, Austria and Denver Colorado: As U.S. technical manager, primary responsibilities included technical development for the Polyfelt line of geosynthetics for the U.S. civil engineering market as well as worldwide applications.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colorado: As technical specialist, responsibilities included directing laboratory research, design and development investigations into geosynthetics and construction materials for use on large western water projects such as dams, canals, power plants and other civil structures. Included were material research, selection and testing, specification writing, large scale pilot test programs, MQA/CQA program design and supervision of site installations. Prime author or contributor to several USBR technical publications incorporating geosynthetics.

University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona: As research engineer at the Water Resources Research Center, responsibilities included research, design and development of engineering materials and methods for use in construction of major water projects including potable water reservoirs, canals and distribution systems. Prime author or contributor to several WRRC technical publications.

Northeast Utilities, Hartford, Connecticut: As field engineer for construction at Northeast Utilities, responsibilities included liaison for many construction projects including additions to power plants, construction of substations, erection of fuel oil pipelines and fuel oil storage tanks. Responsibilities also included detailed review, inspection and reporting on numerous construction projects.

U.S. Navy: Commissioned Naval Officer – Nuclear Program

**PUBLICATIONS:** Over 85 published articles, papers and books.

**CONTACT DETAILS:**

**Ronald K. Frobel, MSCE, P.E.**  
**R. K. Frobel & Associates**  
**Consulting Civil/Geosynthetics Engineers**  
**PO Box 2633**  
**Evergreen, Colorado 80439 USA**  
**Phone 720-289-0300**  
**Email: geosynthetics@msn.com**