

Permit No.	Date	Document ID No.
P1263	August 20, 2013	19561

From: [Williams, Ray](#)
To: [Chao, Ming-tai](#)
Subject: RE: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF
Date: Friday, August 16, 2013 10:38:42 AM

Correspondences - e-mail
Date: **Au 14 – Aug 16, 2013**
Solid Waste Section
Raleigh Central Office

Ming,
To my recollection, the ditch is there for drainage during weather events and does not convey water at other times.
Ray

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE Tablet

----- Original message -----
From: "Chao, Ming-tai" <ming.chao@ncdenr.gov>
Date: 08/14/2013 1:12 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Williams, Ray" <ray.williams@ncdenr.gov>, "Shackelford, Dennis" <dennis.shackelford@ncdenr.gov>
Cc: "Mussler, Ed" <ed.mussler@ncdenr.gov>
Subject: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF

Gentlemen:

I need your help on the buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF which will be located on the top of the closed Sanders Lane LCIDLF (a notification site). According to the property survey map, it is evidently that the closed notification site had major violations for its waste footprints over 2 acres but w/o permit for operation and buffer violation. However, the past is the past. I made the new owner to meet the 100-ft buffer requirement [.0564(9)(b)] except for the existing ditch right next to the access road & the site entrance area (I circled the area of concerns in red in the attached drawing). The Rule .0564(9)(a) requires 50-ft buffer distance to the new waste boundaries. I think if the existing ditch is an intermittent one and it may not be considered "Water" as defined in NCGS 143-212 http://www.ncleg.net/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/PDF/BySection/Chapter_143/GS_143-212.pdf. So the buffer requirement is not applicable. Ray visited the site in 2011, I hope he can confirm if the ditch is perennial or intermittent one. I would like to get your input and consensus on this matter. Thanks for the help.

Ming

From: [Shackelford, Dennis](#)
To: [Mussler, Ed](#); [Chao, Ming-tai](#); [Williams, Ray](#)
Subject: RE: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2013 8:39:50 AM

I agree with Ed. I don't see a problem with it.

And yes I would like to hear what Mr. Williams input will be.

Dennis E. Shackelford
Eastern District Supervisor
Department Of Environment & Natural Resources
Division of Waste Management
Solid Waste Section
225 Green Street, Suite 714
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

dennis.shackelford@ncdenr.gov

.....
Dept. Tel: (910)-433-3300
Office Tel: (910)-433-3349
Fax: (910)-486-0707
.....

<http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wm/sw>

E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

 Go Green! Print this email only when necessary. Thank you for helping NCDENR be environmentally responsible.

From: Mussler, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 1:34 PM
To: Chao, Ming-tai; Williams, Ray; Shackelford, Dennis
Subject: RE: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF

Ming, I think you made a common sense interpretation, . Lets hear what Ray observes.

Thanks

Ed

From: Chao, Ming-tai
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 1:12 PM
To: Williams, Ray; Shackelford, Dennis
Cc: Mussler, Ed
Subject: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF

Gentlemen:

I need your help on the buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF which will be located

on the top of the closed Sanders Lane LCIDLF (a notification site). According to the property survey map, it is evidently that the closed notification site had major violations for its waste footprints over 2 acres but w/o permit for operation and buffer violation. However, the past is the past. I made the new owner to meet the 100-ft buffer requirement [.0564(9)(b)] except for the existing ditch right next to the access road & the site entrance area (I circled the area of concerns in red in the attached drawing). The Rule .0564(9)(a) requires 50-ft buffer distance to the new waste boundaries. I think if the existing ditch is an intermittent one and it may not be considered "Water" as defined in NCGS 143-212 http://www.ncleg.net/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/PDF/BySection/Chapter_143/GS_143-212.pdf. So the buffer requirement is not applicable. Ray visited the site in 2011, I hope he can confirm if the ditch is perennial or intermittent one. I would like to get your input and consensus on this matter. Thanks for the help.

Ming

From: Chao, Ming-tai
To: [Williams, Ray](#); [Shackelford, Dennis](#)
Cc: [Mussler, Ed](#)
Subject: Buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF
Date: Wednesday, August 14, 2013 1:12:00 PM
Attachments: [Pages from DIN 19525_08132013_permit_app.pdf](#)

Gentlemen:

I need your help on the buffer issue at the proposed Craven LCIDLF which will be located on the top of the closed Sanders Lane LCIDLF (a notification site). According to the property survey map, it is evidently that the closed notification site had major violations for its waste footprints over 2 acres but w/o permit for operation and buffer violation. However, the past is the past. I made the new owner to meet the 100-ft buffer requirement [.0564(9)(b)] except for the existing ditch right next to the access road & the site entrance area (I circled the area of concerns in red in the attached drawing). The Rule .0564(9)(a) requires 50-ft buffer distance to the new waste boundaries. I think if the existing ditch is an intermittent one and it may not be considered "Water" as defined in NCGS 143-212 http://www.ncleg.net/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/PDF/BySection/Chapter_143/GS_143-212.pdf. So the buffer requirement is not applicable. Ray visited the site in 2011, I hope he can confirm if the ditch is perennial or intermittent one. I would like to get your input and consensus on this matter. Thanks for the help.

Ming

