



STATE OF
COLORADO

Cazier - DNR, Tim <tim.cazier@state.co.us>

FW: Density Log Update

1 message

Kos, Paul <paul.kos@stantec.com>

Fri, Mar 10, 2023 at 9:41 AM

To: "Tim Cazier, P.E. (Tim.Cazier@state.co.us)" <tim.cazier@state.co.us>

Cc: Jerald Schnabel <jerald_schnabel@castleaggregate.com>

Tim,

See below for the inconsistencies between Brice's log and CTL's log. Based on the data review, Brice's log was correct, and we are working with CTL to get their reports corrected. We are also having them revise their reports to more clearly present failed tests and then the subsequent passing test. We use Brice's log for the monthly report, so the data presented there is correct. Let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Paul

Paul Kos P.E., P.Eng.

Mine Development Services Manager

Mining, Minerals and Metals

Mobile: 303 570-9163
paul.kos@stantec.com

Stantec
410 17th Street, Suite 1400
Denver CO 80202



The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Paul As discussed in the 3:30 PM meeting on 2/23/23:

To answer these questions, please see the following Responses.

1. How CTL reports failed tests. Their log appears to show the failed test on the date of the accepted test, and there is not a record of the accepted test at least on Jan 20.

- They do have the failed tests in their log. The failed tests are not on the day the tests failed, but rather on the day that the re-test has occurred. These failed tests are then reported with the re-test on that date of the re-test. CTL is looking into this and will work on getting these fixed. Brice's log shows the failed test the day it happens and then the passing test on the day it happens, it is just keeping the dates of the failed tests in order and true to the day they occur.

2. Some of the locations do not match between the CTL report and the density log. We were focused on the 2 failed tests in January, and the locations appeared to be off by one test.

- The locations of the two tests are due to the Northing/Easting on, once again a CTL log not being generated correctly and has been discussed with CTL and are looking into this as well. I did do two "re-tests" in some parts where it failed once, to ensure and focus on that area, with the correct N/E location and right next to it a foot or two over to do our due diligence for DRMS, to show them we are taking and making the proper steps to ensure the quality of this project, so in some instances we do have more re-tests then failed tests, for that reason, but there was a deficiency in the N/E of CTL and my report, so those will be matched and corrected.

3. The test number in CTL's report does not match the test number on the density log.

- There was a time where CTL was testing and then Stantec had their employee's testing. Stantec's license ran out, so CTL had to come back in and start testing again. Their numbers follow the order of the number of tests they performed, for auditing reasons. Brice's numbers, which are continuous, go from test 1 all the way to where we are today. The CTL tests are labeled "CTL Test" and then the Stantec Tests are labeled "Stantec Test" all to decipher who has done what tests as the testing agency. The log is being revised to include the CTL number and the overall project test number.