

**Subject:** Follow-Up of Feb 19 Telephone Conference

**From:** Zinith Barbee <zinith.barbee@ncmail.net>

**Date:** Tue, 24 Feb 2009 10:03:31 -0500

**To:** sking@haywoodnc.net

**CC:** dpasko@mcgillengineers.com, "Andrew W. Alexander" <andy@blecorp.com>, "Mark S. Preddy" <mark@blecorp.com>, "Allen.Gaither@ncmail.net" <Allen.Gaither@ncmail.net>

White Oak MSW Landfill  
Haywood County  
Permit 44-07  
Doc ID 6610

On February 19, via telephone, approximately between 3:00 PM and 4:15 PM, I met Dave Pasko and Jeff Bishop of McGill and Asso.'s and Mark Preddy and Andrew Preddy of BLE to discuss revision of the Design Hydrogeologic Report and Environmental Monitoring Plan for Phase 3 and Phase 4. Discussion referenced the SWS technical review letter, dated February 9 (Doc ID 6606). Prior to the meeting, the SWS received additional emailed information, which is also attached to this email.

I explained that the objective is to design a groundwater monitoring system to be in place after Phase 3 and Phase 4 are constructed. The current Environmental Monitoring Plan does not establish the water tables to be monitored or establish the relevant point of compliance for Phase 3 or Phase 4. The wells are also located in cut and fill sections that show them to be either buried or undercut.

Other issues exist. Foremost, a compelling reason to disregard years of pre-existing hydrogeologic data in Phase 3 had not been presented. Understood, is that 17 new wells are installed. Unclear is why 9 more wells were installed in Phase 3 when pre-existing wells there can be utilized. Nonetheless, the half-year of data from the 17 wells is insufficient, especially when only drought and seasonal low, not high, conditions had been monitored. From pre-existing well data in Phase 3 seasonal high and longterm seasonal high groundwater elevations are apparent. Unclear is why this data is discarded.

Design hydrogeologic data in Phase 4 must be comparable to data in Phase 3. In Phase 4 is a seasonal high groundwater elevation "projected" to be lower than a historical drought groundwater elevation. Another well is reportedly "dry" on the same day it contains water.

Finally, more review of SWS regulations is necessary. For instance, Regulation .1631(a)(2)(B) does not state what "will be approved" but what the Division "shall consider". McGill Asso.'s and BLE concurred with most revisions specified in the SWS technical review letter (Doc ID 6606). Revising the groundwater model is also recommended.

In this followup email, the (SWS) also addresses questions raised in two earlier emails it received. The email dated February 13, 2009, 16:06:32, regarding a hydrogeologic map, could be immediately addressed. The earlier email (Doc ID 6609), dated, January 7, 2009, 10:31:14 regarding well abandonment in Phase 3 and Phase 4 could not be addressed until the SWS completed a review of the hydrogeologic studies. The two emails are also attached.

Zinith Barbee  
Hydrogeologist  
Solid Waste Section  
Division of Waste Management

1646 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1646  
tel: 919.508.8401 fax: 919.733.4810

/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./

David Pasko wrote:

Zinith,

It was a pleasure to speak with you yesterday regarding our response to your DHR technical review letter for this project, dated February 9, 2009. Our hydrogeologist, BLE, Inc., will produce a response to your review letter. I know on the phone we talked about removing the Phase 4 portion of the DHR from the submittal, but after discussions with BLE, we have decided to keep Phase 4 as part of the submittal. We feel that BLE has produced a sound argument for handling the seasonal high water questions. We'll submit our response to you in a few days.

We appreciate your assistance with this project. Please don't hesitate to call if you have any questions regarding the project.

Dave Pasko

McGill Associates

<b>6606.pdf</b>	<b>Content-Type:</b> application/pdf <b>Content-Encoding:</b> base64
-----------------	---

<b>DRAFT DHR BLE Review Comments WOLF J07-1957-02-2.pdf</b>	<b>Content-Type:</b> application/pdf <b>Content-Encoding:</b> base64
---	---

<b>White Oak 1957-02 Seasonal WL Analysis Table 3B-4.pdf</b>	<b>Content-Type:</b> application/pdf <b>Content-Encoding:</b> base64
--	---

<b>6609.pdf</b>	<b>Content-Type:</b> application/pdf <b>Content-Encoding:</b> base64
-----------------	---

<b>Response to Comment on Figure 2 in Doc ID 6606.pdf</b>	<b>Content-Type:</b> application/pdf <b>Content-Encoding:</b> base64
---	---