

**From:** [Schoepke, Robert](#)  
**To:** [Russell, Merlin](#)  
**Cc:** [Rick J. Stebnisky](#); [Curtis, Jeff](#); [Tripp, Anthony](#); [Knauss, Elizabeth](#)  
**Subject:** Re: SK Tampa question  
**Date:** Friday, June 27, 2014 11:49:51 AM

---

Thanks Merlin. In that case we'll leave the well as it is since it's only used for water levels currently.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 27, 2014, at 9:30 AM, "Russell, Merlin" <[Merlin.Russell@dep.state.fl.us](mailto:Merlin.Russell@dep.state.fl.us)> wrote:

Rick,

You will be sampling that well again in August as recommended in your June 24, 2014 NAMR#7 so it is premature to abandon the well at this time (or are you proposing not to sample MW-5 in August?). Keep in mind that the August monitoring event may be your last.

In any event, I agree that repairs do not need to be done at this point because the integrity of the well was not compromised. Once site monitoring is completed, the SRCO will require abandonment of all wells so you might want to wait and abandon all of them at the same time.

merlin

---

**From:** Rick J. Stebnisky [<mailto:rstebnisky@ectinc.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2014 3:17 PM  
**To:** Russell, Merlin  
**Subject:** Re: SK Tampa question

Hi Merlin:

Sorry for the delayed response. I wanted to get the facts first :) The illegible word is "manway".

Keith (from our office) went to the site today to tighten up the facts; see attached photo of MW-5. As Keith explained to me:  
The well pad is partly absent and basically destroyed, and the manhole casing & lid are slightly bent (the lid does bolt on to the casing, but not snugly enough to prevent water from entering. It was bolted on when Keith arrived). The actual PVC well casing is fine; it is undisturbed, and total depth below TOC measured by Keith today is same as usual (12.02 ft). So overall, the surface completion is compromised, but the well integrity is not.

That's the new city water line in the background of the photo. Per Chris Sabel (SP? at the facility), there was a leak in the water main there, and the contractors

that fixed the leak apparently damaged the wells' surface completion.

So, what to do? I don't think we actually need MW-5 at this point in this project. I can't imagine any realistic scenario where we would sample that well again, and we already have about a dozen rounds of water levels. As a practical matter, I suggest that we abandon MW-5 rather than repair it. Seems like a waste of money to repair it now [requires a contractor], just for another water level measurement, and then abandon it in the near future when the project is done. Also, I looked at the permit and this approach (abandon the well) does not seem to contradict anything per the permit.

What do you think Merlin?

Thank you ... Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: "Russell, Merlin" <[Merlin.Russell@dep.state.fl.us](mailto:Merlin.Russell@dep.state.fl.us)>

To: Rick Stebnisky <[RStebnisky@ectinc.com](mailto:RStebnisky@ectinc.com)>

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2014 14:38:16 +0000

Subject: SK Tampa question

Rick, the May 27 field log says something (illegible) is broken at MW-5. Same note is on GW elevation form. What was broken? Was it repaired? Thanks.

merlin

*Merlin D. Russell Jr.*

*Professional Geologist II*

*Hazardous Waste Program & Permitting, Room 330G*

*Florida Department of Environmental Protection*

*2600 Blair Stone Road*

*Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400*

*850.245.8796 (work)*

*[merlin.russell@dep.state.fl.us](mailto:merlin.russell@dep.state.fl.us)*

***Monday-Thursday, 7:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m.; Fridays, 7:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m.***

