R. T. HICKS CONSULTANTS, LTD.

901 Rio Grande Blvd NW ▲ Suite F-142 ▲ Albuquerque, NM 87104 ▲ 505.266.5004 ▲ Since 1996
Durango, Co ▲ Carlsbad, NM ▲ Hobbs, NM

June 18, 2020

Ms. Susan Lucas Kamat
NMOCD
1220 S. St. Francis Blvd
Santa Fe, NM
Via Email Susan.LucasKamat@state.nm.us

RE: Advance Energy Partners Dagger 2 Containment and Recycling
Site Specific Variances As Requested by OCD

Dear Ms. Lucas Kamat:

On behalf of Advance Energy Partners Hat Mesa, LLC (AEP), Hicks Consultants submits the attached variances as requested. This package includes an

- Avian Protection Variance
- Fencing Variance
- Alternative Testing Variance
- 40 Mil HDPE as Alternative Secondary Liner Variance (Including Engineer Stamped Technical Memorandum)
- Stamped letters from Ron Frobel PE discussing the applicability of engineering variances to a wide variety of site conditions for in-ground containments; CV included.

These documents are included immediately following this Transmittal Letter. The original registration was transmitted to OCD and the SLO in October of 2019 and re-submitted to you on June 9. In your confirmation of receipt, you requested submission of the attached variances.

AEP will submit monthly water usage reports as a part of operational compliance for this facilty.
If you have any questions or concerns regarding these variances, please contact me. As always, we appreciate your work ethic and attention to detail.

Sincerely,
R.T. Hicks Consultants

Randall T. Hicks PG
Principal

CC: Advance Energy Partners Hat Mesa, LLC
Ryan Mann SLO

VARIANCE TO INSTALL BIRD-X MEGA BLASTER PRO AS PRIMARY HAZING PROGRAM FOR AVIAN SPECIES

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.

FENCING VARIANCE REQUEST FOR RECYCLING CONTAINMENTS

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.

Variances for Alternative Testing Methods

Request for OCD Approval of Alternative Test Methods to Analyze Concentrations of TPH and Chloride

The prescriptive mandates of the Rule that are the subject of this request are the following subsections of NMAC 19.15.17.13 [emphasis added], 19.15.34.14 and 19.15.29. 12 D

> **19.15.17.13 CLOSURE AND SITE RECLAMATION REQUIREMENTS:**
> **D.(5)** The operator shall collect, at a minimum, a five point composite of the contents of the temporary pit or drying pad/tank associated with a closed-loop system to demonstrate that, after the waste is solidified or stabilized with soil or other non-waste material at a ratio of no more than 3:1 soil or other non-waste material to waste, the concentration of any contaminant in the stabilized waste is not higher than the parameters listed in Table II of 19.15.17.13 NMAC.

The referenced Table II, which is reproduced in part below, notes the Method with asterisk signifying: "*Or other test methods approved by the division".

Table II
Closure Criteria for Burial Trenches and Waste Left in Place in Temporary Pits

Depth below bottom of pit to groundwater less than 10,000 mg/l TDS	Constituent	Method*	Limit**
25-50 feet	Chloride	EPA Method 300.0	20,000 mg/kg
	TPH	EPA SW-846 Method 418.1	100 mg/kg

> **19.15.34.14 CLOSURE AND SITE RECLAMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR RECYCLING CONTAINMENTS:**
> **C.** The operator shall test the soils beneath the containment for contamination with a five-point composite sample which includes stained or wet soils, if any, and that sample shall be analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I below.
> **(1)** If any contaminant concentration is higher than the parameters listed in Table I, the division may require additional delineation upon review of the results and the operator must receive approval before proceeding with closure.

The referenced Table I, which is reproduced in part below, notes the Method with asterisk signifying: "*Or other test methods approved by the division".

Table I
Closure Criteria for Recycling Containments

Depth below bottom of containment to groundwater less than 10,000 mg/l TDS	Constituent	Method*	Limit**
51 feet - 100 feet	Chloride	EPA 300.0	10,000 mg/kg
	TPH (GRO+DRO+MRO)	EPA SW-846 Method 8015M	2,500 mg/kg

After sampling solids of more than 50 drilling pits in the Permian Basin, we have observed and reported to OCD on numerous occasions significant problems with non-petroleum drilling additives (e.g. starch) interfering with the laboratory method 418.1. It is not surprising that in many instances we found no correlation between the laboratory results using 418.1 and the results using Method 8015.

We request approval of Method 8015 (GRO + DRO + MRO) for Method 418.1.

> **19.15.29.12 D. CLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.** The responsible party must take the following action for any major or minor release containing liquids.
> **(1)** The responsible party must test the remediated areas for contamination with representative five-point composite samples from the walls and base, and individual grab samples from any wet or discolored areas. The samples must be analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I of 19.15.29.12 NMAC or constituents from other applicable remediation standards.

The referenced Table I, is reproduced in part below.

Table I
Closure Criteria for Soils Impacted by a Release

Minimum depth below any point within the horizontal boundary of the release to ground water less than 10,000 mg/l TDS	Constituent	Method*	Limit**
≤ 50 feet	Chloride***	EPA 300.0 or SM4500 Cl B	600 mg/kg
	TPH (GRO+DRO+MRO)	EPA SW-846 Method 8015M	100 mg/kg
	BTEX	EPA SW-846 Method 8021B or 8260B	50 mg/kg
	Benzene	EPA SW-846 Method 8021B or 8260B	10 mg/kg

We request approval of EPA 300.0 or SM4500 for the analysis of chloride.

Demonstration that OCD Approval Will Provide Equal or Better Protection of Fresh Water, Public Health and the Environment

The purpose of TPH analyses in the Pit Rule is to measure total petroleum hydrocarbons not all non-polar compounds, such as starch or cellulose that can interfere with Method 418.1. While Method 418.1 may provide some useful data for transportation of crude oil or condensate spills to disposal, the addition of non-polar organic materials in drilling fluids, especially for horizontal wells, renders Method 418.1 highly problematic to determine compliance with the Rule. Using Method 8015 for TPH (GRO+DRO+MRO) provides a better measurement of what we believe the Commission intended operators to measure.

In hearings before the Oil Conservation Commission technical arguments were presented regarding the use of SM4500 in lieu of EPA 300.00 for chloride analysis for Rule 29. The Division and the Commission agreed that these two methods provide equal or better protection of fresh water, public health and the environment.

40-MIL HDPE as Alternative Secondary Liner for In Ground Containment

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 x 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) 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

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).

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*

(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

Sincerely Yours,

R K 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

ASTM Geosynthetics Standards 2017
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

32156 Castle Court / Suite 211 / Evergreen, CO 80439 Ph
303-679-0285 Fx 303-679-8955 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

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 liason 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