

State of North Carolina  
Department of Environment  
and Natural Resources  
Division of Waste Management

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor  
Wayne McDevitt, Secretary  
William L. Meyer, Director



December 1, 1997

Mr. Joel L. Storrow, P.E.  
McGill Associates, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2259  
Asheville, North Carolina 28802

Permit ID #	Date	Use (D/F)
bc	3.3.10	DIN

RE: Hydrogeologic Review Of The Revised Transition Plan For The  
Jackson County MSW Landfill, Permit # 50-02

Dear Mr. Storrow,

The Solid Waste Section Hydrogeologic Unit has completed a review of the August 29, 1997, revisions to the Transition Plan for the Jackson County Landfill. There are still several items that need clarification or revision. Please address the following comments and questions:

SUMMARY REPORT

Clarification is needed for section 1.3.1 - Proximity of human and environmental receptors. It is not clear which residences and businesses have public water supply and which have wells.

- Are the builders supply (and other buildings in the vicinity of the builders supply) located at the landfill entrance road (SR 1539) served by the municipal water supply?
- Are the two mobile homes, located approximately 400 feet to the northwest of the landfill, served by wells?
- Are the houses to the north of the landfill, on Wilkey Road (SR 1379), served by wells?
- Are the two "fishing cabins" to the southwest, between the landfill and the Tuckasee River, served by wells?

Some of these structures do not appear on Revised Figure 1, the Local Characterization Study Map.

#### LOCAL AREA STUDY

Section 4.0 of the report does not reflect some of the revisions that have been made:

- Section 4.1 still identifies Figure 1 as "USGS Quadrangle topographic map of the area". The cover sheet for Figure 1 still references a scale of 1" = 1000'. The location of the landfill is plotted incorrectly on the original Figure 1.
- Section 4.1: The paragraph regarding the NGS benchmark does not correspond with the information on the revised Figures.
- Section 4.2: Further clarification is needed regarding sources of water for the residences, businesses, and other structures in the vicinity of the landfill (as discussed in the comments above on the Summary Report).

I assume all of the Figures listed in section 4.1 are being used to illustrate the information required by Rule .1629(b)(2)(A). Some of the residences and businesses do not appear to be shown on Figure 7. There is no discussion of "known or potential sources of contamination". Is the water line the only underground utility in the vicinity of the landfill? These items need to be discussed in Section 4.0 - the Local Area Study.

#### TABLES

Is the survey information in Table 1 still accurate?

#### FIGURES

Figure 1: See comments above for section 4.1

Figure 8: The revised Figure 8 (Proposed Contours) appears to be incorrectly labeled Sheet 1 of 1.

Figure 14: The revised Figure 14 is different than the earlier submittal. It has a larger scale and therefore shows less detail than the previous figure.

WATER QUALITY MONITORING PLAN (WQMP)

Table 7: The note on revised Table 7 refers to Beryllium, Cobalt, Nickel, Thallium, and Vanadium as "organics". These constituents are metals, not organics. The note refers to these constituents as "organics" and states these samples were "first analyzed" for these constituents. This raises the question: Were four base-line samples taken for each of these five metals?

Figures: The site is incorrectly located on Figure 3, and to some extent on Figure 1. For Figure 4, my earlier question regarding "the elevation of the Tuckasegee River at a location projected along the A-A' Profile" has still not been addressed.

Appendix F: Monitoring Well Construction: The Solid Waste Section still has concerns regarding the construction of MW-2. The extended filter pack in a fractured bedrock well could result in dilution of contaminants that would mask the detection of a contaminant release. Since the facility is already in assessment monitoring, we will not require that the detection monitoring system be modified at this time. However, future assessment of ground-water quality at the facility will probably make it necessary to install additional monitoring wells in the vicinity of well MW-2.

Appendix H: SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN:

3.5.2 Sample Blanks: The last paragraph contradicts the previous paragraph. It needs to be clarified that the field equipment blank will be analyzed for all constituents and the trip blank will be analyzed for organic constituents.

Table 1: The metals Beryllium, Cobalt, Nickel, Thallium, and Vanadium should not be crossed out. The NC GW Standard for Nickel should not be crossed out. The "proposed" standard for Antimony should be crossed out. While some of the metals do not presently have NC GW Standards, they must still be analyzed and statistically evaluated.

Mr. Joel Storrow  
Jackson Transition Plan  
Page 4

Please provide the additional information and revisions as soon as possible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (919) 733-0692, extension 258.

Sincerely,

Bobby Lutfy  
Hydrogeologist  
Solid Waste Section

cc: Susan Leistiko, Solid Waste Section  
Jim Patterson, SWS - Asheville Regional Office  
Tom Massie, Jackson County Planning