

Scanned by <i>Zinith Barbee</i>	Date 7/16/10	Doc ID # 11052
------------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Barbee, Zinith

From: Andrew W. Alexander [andy@blecorp.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 11:46 AM
To: Barbee, Zinith; Dave Pasko
Cc: Preddy, Mark (blecorp); Lane, Ervin; Keller, Andrea; Poindexter, Mark; King, Stephen (Haywood Co NC); Ballew, Denise (Haywood)
Subject: Re: MW-9 at White Oak Landfill. Permit 44-07

Hello Everyone,

Dave Pasko and I have talked about this email and Dave requested that I address both points in a response on behalf of Haywood County.

1) MW-9 issue -- I reviewed the screened intervals of the former MW-3 and MW-9 monitoring wells as published in the DHR and/or estimated from the data therein. It appears that MW-3 was screened from 2429.5 to 2414.5 (15 foot screen) and MW-9 was screened from approximately 2422.95 to 2417.5 (5 foot screen). These two wells screened similar intervals and both were reported to be installed at or near the top of rock. We conclude from these data that the installation of a replacement MW-9 well would be redundant and is not necessary.

2) MW-20 issue -- I reviewed Figure 6 (Water Table Map -- 2/14/2008) from the DHR. The map shows that a hydraulic divide is present along the southwestern portion of Phase 4. Based on these data, MW-20 was proposed as a future compliance well for Phase 4 because the location receives (southwesterly) flow from the Phase 4 area. Based on this information, the proposed MW-20 location would not be representative of upgradient (background) conditions for Phase 3 and should not be installed or used as such. Based on the groundwater maps published in each semi-annual groundwater monitoring report we conclude that the existing background wells (MW-11S and MW-11D) are adequately positioned to be representative of upgradient (background) conditions for all MSWLF phases and should continue to be used for that purpose without supplement.

We request that the DWM provide a regulatory decision on the two issues above so that Haywood County can contract for the installation of the required Phase 3 groundwater monitoring wells. Thanks, --Andy

Andrew W. Alexander, P.G., RSM
Bunnell-Lammons Engineering, Inc. (BLE)
6004 Ponders Court
Greenville, South Carolina 29615
(864) 288-1265 (voice)
(864) 288-4430 (fax)
(864) 201-5530 (cell)
andy@blecorp.com
www.blecorp.com

This electronic transmission contains information from the consulting firm of Bunnell-Lammons Engineering, Inc., that may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended solely for the recipient. Use by any other party is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you received this transmission in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (864-288-1265) or by email (info@blecorp.com). Thank you for your cooperation.

----- Original Message -----

From: Barbee, Zinith
To: Dave Pasko ; Andrew W. Alexander
Cc: Lane, Ervin ; Keller, Andrea ; Poindexter, Mark
Sent: Friday, July 02, 2010 1:58 PM
Subject: MW-9 at White Oak Landfill. Permit 44-07

Groundwater Monitoring Well, MW-9
White Oak Landfill
Permit 44-07
Doc ID 11011

This is a followup of our conversation on the afternoon of June 30 regarding elimination of existing MW-9. Prior discussion with the SWS on June 25 pertained to first, replacing the well in its original location; second, relocating the well to an uphill location. On June 30 McGill Associates (McGill) and Bunnell-Lammons Engineering, Inc. (BLE) proposed eliminating the well. MW-9 is part of the Environmental Monitoring Plan (Doc ID 5808) approved in April, 2009 (Doc ID 7276). Discussion referenced one of two maps presented to Mark Poindexter on June 24, forwarded to me on June 25 (Doc ID 10990). On that map three locations for MW-9 are shown--original, existing, and proposed. Also in the forwarded communication, McGill presented some background information for MW-9.

Understood is McGill's and BLE's logic for proposing to eliminate MW-9. As mentioned in my previous email (Doc ID 10923), MW-3 and MW-3D appeared already adequate for monitoring near lagoon. Nonetheless, MW-9 had been installed, reflecting recognition of a need for additional groundwater monitoring and sampling. It appears that MW-9 may have been intended to be at an intermediate depth between the shallow and deep wells near the lagoon. More information about MW-9 is necessary before the SWS can evaluate whether to eliminate it from the Environmental Monitoring Plan that McGill and BLE presented in April 2009.

Also conveyed in discussions on June 25 and 30 had been the SWS's concern about possible inadequacy of the MW-11 well cluster as the sole upgradient groundwater monitoring wells for the landfill; lack of hydrogeologic data south of Phases 1,2,3, and 4; and utilization of proposed MW-16 and MW-20 for monitoring Phase 3.

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.