

Cody Barnes
Office of Public Facilitation
New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)
P.O. Box 5469
Santa Fe, NM 87505

1/14/2020

Re: Comments by Jerome Hansen on the Hearing Officer's Report in GWB 19-28 (P).

Dear Mr, Barnes,

Please refer to the page number of the Hearing Officer's Report.

P. 4 Undue Risk to Property – The pits presently pose a risk to the adjoining property to the east. If effluent from the septic cells has seeped under the berms, as aerial imagery strongly seems to show, property damage has already occurred (ground subsidence, pollution of the soil). This damage would materially affect the property's value and create additional costs to the landowners to remedy the problem.

p.4 Addition of Lime – Although the addition of lime will help sterilize the sewage, it will do nothing to mitigate the hazards of chemicals like PFSA's (found in pizza boxes among other things) and heavy metals, which are undoubtedly being concentrated by continued discharge into these cells.

*p.9 (*19)* There is no evidence on the ground for the Mark D. Miller well. It is probably mis-located in the State Engineer records.

Attachment 1 – pg. 2, terms & conditions, second bullet: It is quite likely that 150 ft. will be in the middle of the first basalt. How will the well be drilled through the basalt? A hollow stem auger will not be able to drill the basalt. Unless the borehole is drilled with air (highly unlikely), the rig will have to use a water-based mud, which will dilute or otherwise disguise the presence of elevated nitrogen content. Instead, if elevated nitrogen levels are encountered at the top of the basalt, it should be assumed that effluent has penetrated the basalt, and the closure plan initiated.

General comments: NMED really needs to ascertain if seepage of effluent is occurring into adjacent property. If this is the case, the permit has been issued to discharge sewage up to an area that is neither permitted nor zoned for discharge,

The geohydrological study of the site will be the first objective assessment of the contamination hazard of the cells to the groundwater conducted in 20 years. The test hole for this study should be located in the extreme eastern part of cell 4. Effluent seeps downward from the cells toward the arroyo over which the cells were built, and then under the berms and into the low spot in the NW corner of the adjacent property to the east. This has caused ground subsidence which channels additional effluent, with the result that the deepest penetration of effluent is probably beneath this subsidence pit. The closest drill site on S&R property is in the eastern part of cell E. Non-compliance with the geohydrologic study should be grounds for closure of the cells.

Thank you,

Jerome B. Hansen

01426

