

October 19, 2006

MEMORANDUM

To: Ed Mussler,
Solid Waste Section

From: Brian Wootton

Subject: MSWLF Site Suitability Study – Phase 2
Davidson County
Permit No. 29-06– Final Comments

I have reviewed the Site Suitability Application for the proposed Phase 2 MSWLF, pertaining to hydrogeologic concerns. The original application was dated April 2002, a revised application was submitted May 2006, and subsequent supporting information was received by the Solid Waste Section (SWS) on September 1, 2006 and October 17, 2006, respectively.

Additional information provided by Joan Smyth, P.G., on behalf of G.N. Richardson & Associates (GNRA) dated October 17, 2006 to Brian Wootton, (SWS) states in-part in the narrative (pages 1 & 2) the following: *“As we discussed, two construction footprints are presented in the Facility Plan. These are referred to as Option A and Option B. Option A (shown on Sheet S3A in the Facility Plan) avoids two areas where bedrock was detected above ground water. In these areas more investigation is needed prior to approval of suitability. Option A is the footprint we expect to receive a letter of Site Suitability for at this time. Option B (shown on Sheet S3B in the Facility Plan) shows the entire footprint we hope to have approved for Site Suitability after additional characterization is performed that indicates the bedrock areas excluded in Option A are monitorable”.*

“Additionally, the text of the Facility Plan has been modified to include estimated tonnages and site life for each Option shown”.

“In interest of a through hydrogeologic evaluation, we have shown Option B on our geologic drawings included in the Site Hydrogeologic Report. However, a note has been added to each drawing indicating that it is understood that the Option B footprint shown will require more investigation. At that time we believe the Option A footprint has been shown to be suitable. The Option B footprint is only shown for better evaluation of the site. As we have discussed, it is our intention to perform additional geologic evaluation of the two shallow bedrock areas and hope to obtain site suitability for these areas in the future. However, due to the lack of airspace in the existing Phase 1 landfill, it is imperative that we acquire Site Suitability for as much of Phase 2 as possible at this time”.

Page 5 and 6, Section 3.3 of the Site Suitability Report (revised May 2006) states in-part the following: *“GNRA is currently applying for a Section 401/404 permit for the ~0.25 acres of wetland impacted by the first proposed cell. The remaining impact (approximately 0.55 acres) will not be impacted for approximately 35 years. Representatives from the Division of Water Quality have indicated that this impact is too far on the future to permit now and a permit should be applied for prior to receiving a Permit to Construct for the proposed cell that the impact is in.”*

Based on the same phone conversation (9/8/06) with Joan Smyth, the small 0.25 wetland acreage (i.e. as noted on Figure 5) will receive approval via the Division of Water Quality prior to Construction of the first cell.

Based on the information submitted, I have no objection to issuance of Site suitability with the exception of the two (2) areas of the site mentioned above, unless future hydrogeologic characterization deems these areas suitable in the future. I agree to proceed with Option A mentioned above.

Please contact me with any questions or comments. I can be reached at (919) 508-8524 or by e-mail.

Sincerely,



Brian Wootton

cc: Hugh Jernigan, Solid Waste Section