

March 21, 2017

Mr. Darren Parkin
Water Resource Specialist
City of Laramie
P.O. Box C
Laramie, WY 82070

RE: Review of the Site Specific Investigation Report for City of Laramie North Side Tank Project, dated March 10, 2017 (originally dated February 7, 2017), prepared by the Trihydro Corporation.

Darren:

WWC Engineering has reviewed the referenced Site Specific Investigation. The conclusion presented in the SSI is that the North Side Tank Project poses low contamination risk to the Casper Aquifer. Based on the information presented in the March 10th report, WWC concurs with the opinion of low contamination risk. The City should review items 4, 5, and 6 below.

For completeness, we have examined the previous comments to see if they are adequately addressed. In our original review Dated February 17th, we identified 15 items that associated with the original report (dated February 7th) that were not adequately addressed. WWC's current review is organized in terms of the 15 items originally identified.

1. Site plan in Appendix B includes contours. Figure 2 does a good job of illustrating the regional drainage situation. Adequate.
2. Figure 1 shows the pipelines and tank east of the CAPA boundary. Adequate.
3. WWC assumes that developments east of the CAPA boundary that receive water from this project, if any, will not increase aquifer contamination risk.
4. Project description is adequate.

The blasting issue is addressed by anticipating the exclusion of blasting during construction. WWC suggests that the specifications for the project specifically exclude blasting.

Drain field purpose is explained adequately.

5. The document is adequately clear that potential contaminants will not be stored, handled, or generated. Certainly, construction and maintenance will include periodic and temporary use of vehicles that contain liquid fuels including gasoline. The City might consider having the project specifications address spill containment and control, if they don't already, to a higher degree than projects not in the CAPA boundary.
6. Figure 2 does a good job of showing the regional drainage situation.

Information provided about the #15 Working Corral well (identified as the nearest well) is clear and addresses our initial comment. The well was not found.

As lands near this well (and other wells) are developed and served by the proposed project, the City should review well completion information and inspections should be conducted to identify where the wells are located. Poorly completed wells and wells in drainages may be vulnerable features, even though they may be west of the of the CAPA boundary.

7. Figure 2 shows drainages adequately.
8. Section 7 and supporting information adequately addresses the flood plain comment.
9. Figure 2 shows the regional ridge and drainage situation adequately.
10. References to pipelines being part of the development and inside the CAPA boundary are adequate.
11. This comment is adequately addressed.
12. The reference to Wyo GW being the author of the report is wrong. WWC Engineering was the author of record. Wyo GW a contributor. Not a big deal.
13. Our initial comment on the potentiometric surface map remains. If the Pot surface is "extrapolated" to the west, sure.
14. The Figure 1 Explanation shading and symbology for Pcd and Pce is not the same as that used on the map.
15. The original comment was directed at trying to clearly understand the "subject property". May be its obvious, but the "subject property" is not just the tank as Figure 1 seems to indicate (and the legal description on 1-1 states without reference to section 26 too). The project area or subject property also includes the road and pipeline corridor from the tank to the CAPA boundary to the west.

Sincerely,



Murray Schroeder, P.E.
Branch Manager

MS:lw

