From:	<u>Yu, Olivia, EMNRD</u>
To:	"Frank Engallina"
Cc:	Billings, Bradford, EMNRD
Subject:	RE: Angell #1 - Remediation Update
Date:	Friday, August 18, 2017 6:41:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Dear Frank:

FYI, NMOCD determines that for 1RP-1849, Method 9056 is an acceptable substitute for Method 300. Please note that for other 1RPs, the current permissible chloride tests are Method SM4500 and Method 300. Split soil samples sent to a laboratory using both Method 300 and an alternative for chloride analysis are highly encouraged.

Review of submitted delineation and remediation documents have not been completed. Please be advised that should you decided to organize equipment for backfilling and liner placement, that would be considered conducted at-risk. However, an evaluation for backfill approval will most likely occur on Wednesday, August 23, if you want to schedule these activities for later in the week (August 24 or 25).

Olivia

From: Frank Engallina [mailto:pikeenergyservices@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 10:01 AM
To: Yu, Olivia, EMNRD <Olivia.Yu@state.nm.us>
Subject: Angell #1 - Remediation Update

Olivia,

I left a message for you yesterday with an update on the status of the Angell #1. Confirmation samples of the sidewalls report levels of COCs below the RALs for the site. I have attached the summary table and sample location map for your review and I would like to go over it with you before we set the liner and backfill the excavation (Thursday or Friday) to ensure concurrence. Please let me know if you have time for a quick call.

Thank you,

Frank Engallina

Pike Energy Services, LLC 321 Pike Road San Antonio, TX 78209 210.363.2431 cell pikeenergyservices@gmail.com



Frank Engallina Pike Energy Services 321 Pike Rd San Antonio, TX 78209

June 7, 2017

SITE: CASS STATE #1H

RE: Soil methods for Chloride by IC

Background

Pike Energy Services provided ESC Lab Science with several sets of soil for chloride analysis. The samples were analyzed by method 9056. It was made known to ESC that the samples were taken in New Mexico and the appropriate method would be method 300. A senior scientist reviewed the methods for differences. The samples are analyzed in the same manner, the only differences were noted to be in the quality control acceptable ranges. Method 300 was only more limiting in the LSC recovery being 90-110%. Method 9056 has a range of 80-120%.

The 9056 data for the following laboratory numbers were reviewed and found to also be compliant with method 300: L913670, L913459, L912031, L906212, L906255, L897976, L895431, L895592, L895104, L894611, L886659, L886687.

Please feel free to contact me for any additional information.

Sincerely,

William Mock VP Lab Operations ESC Lab Sciences 12065 Lebanon Road Mt. Juliet, TN 37122