

5102Permit1994 - Batch No.____

Johnston Co

51021994

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

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor
Jonathan B. Howes, Secretary
William L. Meyer, Director



CERTIFIED MAIL- RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

December 27, 1994

Ms. Joyce H. Ennis
Clerk to the Johnston County Board of Commissioners
Box 1049
Smithfield, NC 27577

Re: Johnston County Landfill Site Study

Dear Ms. Ennis,

In accordance with North Carolina General Statute 130A-294 (copy enclosed), the Solid Waste Section (Section) hereby forwards to you one copy of the following document:

Subtitle D Landfill Site Application Report for Proposed Expansion of the Johnston County Landfill, Johnston County, North Carolina, Final Revision December 1994. Submitted by McKim and Creed Engineers, P.A.

If you need additional copies of this document, please contact Mr. Phthisic at Public Utilities.

N.C.G.S. 130A-294 (b1)(2) requires that the applicable unit of government(s) hold a public hearing when sufficient interest exists regarding the proposed landfill siting. The Section received a copy of the resolution adopted November 7, 1994. Please advise the Section as to whether or not this public hearing meets the requirements of N.C.G.S. 130A-294 (b1)(2). If it does not meet these requirements, please schedule a public hearing in accordance with these requirements.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. If you have any questions, please contact the Section at 919-733-0692.

Sincerely,

Edward F. Mussler, III E.I.T.
Solid Waste Section

cc: James C. Coffey DSWM Bob Harding DSWM
Terry Dover DSWM C.T. Clayton, Mckim & Creed



MCKIM & CREED

December 13, 1994

M&C 0358-0036.OR (10)

Edward F. Mussler, III, E.I.T
Environmental Engineer
North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687

ENGINEERS

SURVEYORS

ARCHITECTS

PLANNERS

RE: NC Department of Cultural Resources Response to Archaeological Survey
of Proposed Johnston County Landfill
Johnston County, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Mussler:

As stated in a previously submitted comment response letter to you dated November 14, 1994, McKim & Creed sent a copy of the Archaeological Survey conducted at the proposed Johnston County Landfill site to the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources (NCDCCR) for review and comment. Enclosed, please find a copy of NCDCCR's comments and recommendations letter, which is submitted for inclusion in the site application.

If you have any questions please call me or Mike Sanchez.

Sincerely,

MCKIM & CREED ENGINEERS, P.A.

C.T. Clayton, P.E.
Project Manager

SUITE 117

BUILDING 1

5625 DILLARD ROAD

CARY, NC 27511

PHONE 919/233-8091

FAX 919/233-8031

cc: Haywood Phthisic, Johnston County Director of Utilities
Tim Broome, P.E., McKim & Creed

03580036\12134ms1.ctc

51-02



North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources

James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor
Betty Ray McCain, Secretary

Division of Archives and History
William S. Price, Jr., Director

December 6, 1994

Michael J. E. Sanchez, E.I.T.
Project Engineer
McKim & Creed
Suite 117, Building 1
5625 Dillard Road
Cary, NC 27511

RECEIVED
DEC 9 1994
Ans'd.....

Re: Archaeological survey report, Johnston County Landfill,
ER 94-8402, ER 95-7783

Dear Mr. Sanchez:

Thank you for your letter of October 25, 1994, and the accompanying archaeological
survey report by Thomas Hargrove. We apologize for the delay in our response.

For purposes of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we
concur that the following properties are not eligible for the National Register of Historic
Places under Criterion D:

31JT265&265**, 31JT266, 31JT267, 31JT268, 31JT269, 31JT270&270**,
31JT271&271**, 31JT272**, 31JT273, 31JT274, 31JT275, 31JT276

All of these sites are too disturbed to retain sufficient integrity to yield information
important to history or prehistory.

The report meets our office's guidelines and those of the Secretary of the Interior. Based
on the results of the survey, we do not recommend additional archaeological investigations
at the proposed landfill site.

The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic
Preservation Act of 1966 and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Regulations
for Compliance with Section 106, codified at 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the
above comment, please contact Renee Gledhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at
919/733-4763.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of David Brook

David Brook
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

DB:slw

cc: North Carolina Division of Solid Waste
T. Hargrove



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



James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor
Jonathan B. Howes, Secretary
William L. Meyer, Director

November 15, 1994

Mr. C.T. Clayton
McKim and Creed Engineers, PA
5625 Dillard Road, Suite 117
Cary, NC 27511

Re: Technical Review of Site Hydrogeologic Report - Proposed Johnston Co. MSWLF

Dear Mr. Clayton,

A Technical Review of the Site Hydrogeologic Report has been completed. Further information is necessary in order to continue the review process.

The following comments are pursuant to the requirements of 15A NCAC 13B .1623 (a) and are directed to McKim and Creed and to S&ME. Portions of .1623 (a) not addressed below should, at this time, be considered as having met the Technical Review requirements of the Site Hydrogeologic Report; however, additional information may be requested at a later date.

(a)(5) Provide a ground magnetic survey which delineates the thickness and trend of the diabase dike under the western portion of the site and which demonstrates if other diabase dikes are present under the site.

(a)(7)(D) Provide a discussion of any natural (excluding precipitation and evapo-transpiration) or man-made activities that have a potential for causing water table fluctuations at the site.

(a)(13)(B) Provide a discussion of the ground-water flow regime of the site focussing on the relationship of the MSWLF units to ground-water receptors.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (919) 733-0692.

Sincerely,

Brad Atkinson, Hydrogeologist
Solid Waste Section

cc: Walt Beckwith, S&ME

JOHNSTON COUNTY TRACKING SHEET

570

August 17, 1994	Site Application received by SWS
September 29, 1994	Meeting w/ EFM and Mike Sanchez (MS) of Mckim & Creed, verbally discussed the application and informed him that the facility drawings would need to be redone, and that the conceptual for the whole facility must be presented. Discussed future design issues like 3:1 inside slopes, stability etc.
October 5, 1994	Faxed of the site technical review letter in draft form to MS
October 7, 1994	Technical Review Letter on Engineering sent to McKim&Creed
November 7, 1994	Meeting with Johnston county, Coffey, and Meyers re site and land application of sludge. Jim told could not use borrow off new site, jim said would try to get the geology review by end of month
November 14, 1994 November 15, 1994	Received response to comments on Engineering Geological Technical review of site application sent
December 6, 1994	Engineer reviewed submittal of response to comments. Will begin to prepare Site Suitability Letter and a memo of "things to remember in preparing the permit to construct. Brad reported that CT Clayton reported that the mag survey was underway and that the report should be here soon.
December , 1994 December 14, 1994	Mag Survey received Ed M Spoke with C.T. Clayton of Mckim and Creed, about 3 pm. Told him that we in the section had looked at and discussed the proposed placement of the leachate lagoon on the old site. Told him know because we could not monitor it seperately to ensure that it is not leaking, and also it would stall permit process. He said ok. I am procedding with the site suitability letter.
December 16, 1994 December 19, 1994	Draft site suitability letter prepared and faxed to C.T. Letter from Cultural Resources submitted SITE SUITABILITY LETTER ISSUED
December 28, 1994	Letter sent to Clerk of Commissioners re public hearing as required by 130A 294(b1)(2), and to Phistic re zoning as required by (b1)(4). Copy of app sent to clerk.



November 14, 1994

M&C 0358-0036.OR (10)

Edward F. Mussler, III, E.I.T.
Environmental Engineer
North Carolina Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-7687

ENGINEERS

SURVEYORS

ARCHITECTS

PLANNERS

RE: Responses to NCDEHNR Comments on Johnston Co. Site Application
Johnston County Landfill, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Mussler:

This letter is submitted in response to the NCDEHNR comments regarding the Johnston County Landfill Site Application as detailed in your October 7, 1994 letter to me. This submittal includes as Attachment 1, two copies of revised Sections II through V, in their entirety. However, only revised appendices to each section are included. All pages containing revised text are clearly identified with a footer containing the revision date. Neither S&ME's hydrogeological investigation report nor ARC's archaeological survey report have been revised, and therefore are omitted from this submittal. Four of the five drawings included in the original application have been revised and three additional drawings have been included in the site application. Two copies of all eight drawings are included in this submittal.

The following responses appear in the same order as presented in your October 7, 1994 letter. In addition, as discussed in the latter part of this letter, we are submitting a copy of the sludge land application permit (with drawings) recently issued to Johnston County since the permitted area involves the proposed landfill site.

SUITE 117

Regional Characterization Study

BUILDING 1

Section II of the site application report has been revised to address the comments regarding the regional characterization study.

5625 DILLARD ROAD

CARY, NC 27511

Local Characterization Study

PHONE 919/233-8091

Section II of the site application report has been revised to address the comments regarding the local characterization study. In addition, a lighter copy of the aerial

FAX 919/233-8031

51-02

Edward F. Mussler
November 14, 1994
Page 2

photograph included in the original site application is included as Sheet No. 4 of the revised drawings. A north arrow, the property boundary, and a legend have been added to the aerial photograph but because of the difficulty in producing a light copy without losing too many of the features, existing features such as floodplains and wetlands have not been identified. However, these features are clearly shown on Sheet No. 2, Proposed Facility Plan.

A copy of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 370138 0100 B, which contains the 100-year floodplain surrounding the Johnston County Landfill Facility, has been included as Section II-Appendix B.

Location Restrictions

As stated above, the referenced floodplain map is included as Section II-Appendix B. The wetland delineation plat provided in the original site application also contains property boundary survey information for all of the proposed landfill area. Therefore, since this plat is already in accordance with your recommendation to include the wetland delineation on the property survey plat, no revisions were needed in responding to this comment. Please note, however, that Section III-Appendix C has been modified to include both the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers approval letter and the wetland plat.

In regard to the text provided as part of the State Nature and Historic Preserve demonstration, this discussion has been transferred to the Cultural Resources demonstration as recommended in your letter. Furthermore, we contacted Ms. Carol Tingley, NCDEHNR Division of Parks and Recreation. Ms. Tingley stated that land under this category is State-owned land, which the proposed landfill site is not. Also, Ms. Tingley stated that Johnston County does not contain any State Parks nor State Historic Preserves. The State Nature and Historic Preserve demonstration has been revised to include this information.

In response to the NCDEHNR Division of Solid Waste Management comments, the archaeological survey report performed on the proposed landfill site, has recently been submitted to the NCDEHNR Division of Cultural Resources for review and comment. A copy of these comments will be forwarded to your office upon receipt.

In accordance with your October 25, 1994 telephone conversation with Mr. C.J. Poran of our office, an additional subsection regarding Unstable Areas has been



Edward F. Mussler
November 14, 1994
Page 3

added to the Location Restriction Demonstration. This information addresses the questions raised in the NCDEHNR comments letter that you sent and therefore supplements the information included in the S&ME geotechnical report, which was provided as Attachment I to the site application report.

Local Government Approval

The Johnston County Board of Commissioners resolution approving the proposed landfill site was passed on November 7, 1994 and is included in Section IV-Appendix A. However, other than as shown in the updated Public Hearing minutes included as Section IV-Appendix B, there is no other documentation proving that the public hearing notice was actually run on the radio and television.

Proposed Facility Plan

The Proposed Facility Plan drawing included in the original site application submittal has been revised to show the new areas for Phases 6, 7, and 8. As you and Mike Sanchez discussed during your September 29, 1994 meeting, although the conceptual design of the Phase 5 area was adequate, conceptual design of Phases 6, 7, and 8 needed to be added to the site application drawings. Therefore, three additional drawings have been included to show the proposed subgrading plan, the proposed leachate collection system, and the proposed final grade plan. These drawings have been created in accordance with your recommendations as related to Mike during your meeting. Consequently, these drawings are not in the same format as the conceptual design for Phase 5. All drawings will be made consistent during the next permitting phase.

The sections of the site application report concerning the proposed facility plan has been revised in accordance with the NCDEHNR comments addressed in your letter. Please note that the 590,000 cubic yards of available soil mentioned in the comments letter is in error and has been recomputed. The total amount of borrow required for construction, operation, and closure of all phases is 770,000 cubic yards. In addition, considerably more detail about the soil resources and needs from all the phases has been added to Section V, Proposed Facility Plan.

Sludge Land Application

Enclosed as Attachment 2 to this letter, please find a copy of a sludge land application permit issued to Johnston County on September 30, 1994 and a drawing showing the permitted area. As shown on the drawing, the permitted area



Edward F. Mussler
November 14, 1994
Page 4

includes almost the entire proposed landfill Phases 5, 6, 7, and 8. Although this permit was issued in late September, land application of the sludges to the these permitted areas was postponed until comment was received from your office as to how this would impact the permitting of the proposed lined landfill. Consequently, on November 3, 1994, a meeting involving Jim Coffey and Bill Meyer from your office, Haywood Phthisic, Director of Utilities for Johnston County, and Tim Broome and myself of McKim & Creed Engineers was held to discuss this and several other issues. It was agreed by all parties that the sludge could be applied to the proposed landfill area, as permitted, without adversely impacting the suitability of this land for a new, lined landfill. The site application report has been updated to incorporate this information in the "*Commercial/Industrial Buildings and Other Potential Sources of Contamination*" discussion included in the Section II, Local Study subsection.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me or Mike Sanchez.

Sincerely,

McKIM & CREED ENGINEERS, P.A.



C.T. Clayton, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: Haywood Phthisic, Director of Utilities (Letter without attachments)
Tim Broome, P.E., McKim & Creed (Letter without attachments)

Attachments

October 7, 1994

Mr. C.T. Clayton
McKim & Creed Engineers, PA
5625 Dillard Road Suite 117
Cary, NC 27511

RE: Technical Review, Johnston County Subtitle D Landfill Site Application

Dear Mr. Clayton,

Johnston County proposes to establish a MSWLF facility not previously permitted by the Division of Solid Waste Management (the Division). Rule .1603 (a)(1), of the NC Solid Waste Management Rules (15A NCAC 13B .1600), directs that a site study shall be submitted, and subsequently, an application for a permit to construct as set forth in Paragraph (a) of Rule .1617. The site study requirements are found in Rule .1618, Site Study for MSWLF Facilities.

The Solid Waste Section (the Section) is performing a technical review on the engineering portion of the site application submitted by McKim & Creed, on behalf of Johnston County. This review involves evaluating the Johnston County site application with respect to the NC Solid Waste Management Rules, 15A NCAC 13B .1618. The following information must be submitted to the Section so that we may continue the review process.

Regional characterization study .1618(c)(1)

The regional characterization study must include a report and a map (.1618(c)(1)). This study needs a summary report of the items discussed in this section. The report should characterize the region and identify items such as where the landfill is physically, in relation to an urban area, what the general land use surrounding the landfill is, and other factors which would show suitability for this site as a Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Facility (MSWLF).

Public Water Supply Wells-

Is there a groundwater divide separating the two downgradient public water supply wells?

What is the size and yield of the closet wells?

Are there any surface water intakes nearby?

Residential Subdivisions -

Approximately how many homes are in the subdivision? Are there any homes in the area that are not part of the subdivision? What is their water supply?

Local characterization study .1618(c)(2)

The local characterization study must include report and a map (.1618(c)(2)). This study needs a summary report of the items discussed in this section. The report should characterize the local area and identify things like the proposed disposal site and any easements, existing land use and zoning of the site and the surrounding properties, other potential sources of contamination, and the existing features of the site as identified in .1618(c)(2)(G), and other factors which would show suitability for this site as a Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Facility (MSWLF).

Aerial Photograph-

The reproduction of the aerial photograph is too dark to allow proper use and to identify the physical characteristics of the site such that a proper correlation between the map and the features can be made. The aerial should be marked with a legend, scale, and North arrow. The property boundary and the 2000 foot radius should also be included. It would be useful to also identify the local area study items of interest as listed in the rule. Pertinent existing topography features such as flood plains and wetlands should also be delineated.

Existing Land Use and Zoning-

Does the County own any additional land immediately adjacent to the proposed site, in any direction? Does the county control any of the property across the creeks?

Private Residences and Schools-

Do any of the residences have wells within 500 feet of the landfill?

Other Sources of Contamination-

The existing landfill should be identified as a potential source of contamination, as well as commenting on any known or suspected path of travel, whether or not it is felt that any existing contamination will affect the new proposed site, and can the site be adequately monitored to detect the source of contamination. Is there an underground storage tank on the existing site? Where are the land application fields, and could they impact the proposed site?

Potable wells and well documentation-

In the absence of well completion data on the surrounding wells, information should be gathered on typical well installation in the area. In particular the common size, depth

and yield should be obtained. Local well drillers could be a source of this information.
What is the resource value of the underlying aquifer?

Existing Topography-

Please provide a copy of the flood map used to identify the floodplain.

Site Hydrogeologic Report .1618(c)(3)

This review letter only addresses the engineering portions of the site application. A technical review of the hydrogeologic report will be submitted under separate cover by the Section Hydrogeologist.

Location Restrictions .1618(c)(4) (which refers to §.1622)

Floodplain-

Please provide a copy of the referenced FEMA map.

Wetlands-

It is advisable that the wetland delineation be included on the property survey plat and properly signed off by the Army Corp of Engineers.

State Nature and Historic Preserve-

The demonstration listed under this category more appropriately addresses Cultural Resources, §.1622(7). Is any of the land of the proposed site included in the State Nature and Historic Preserve?

Cultural Resources §.1622(7)-

Was the cultural resource study that was done and completed in June of 1994 submitted to the agency, and do they concur with the findings of the consultant?

Unstable Areas-

What are the expected soil characteristics and soil strength of the underlying soils and what type of settlements are anticipated. What measures will be taken during the next phase to identify particular soil characteristics needed to properly engineer the system? Are there any anticipated limits to a MSWLF that preliminary soil information has revealed?

Local government approval §.1618(c)(5)

The final local government resolution and minutes of the meeting need to be forwarded to the Section. Is there documentation that the public service announcements that were placed with radio and TV were actually run.

Proposed Facility Plan §.1618(c)(6)

The conceptual plan for the entire facility must be presented. The written report should include a summary of the finding and also include the findings of the geologic report. Of importance is to identify all the activities proposed for the site, a description of the site both topographically and geologically, and any possible limitations or obstacles to overcome. Detailed engineering plans and facility plans will be prepared for the first phase of development during the next phase of the permitting process. The facility drawings for this plan must identify, conceptually, all of the phases, cell locations, final contours, etc (see the requirements of §.1619 (d) & (e). Is it planned to construct the entire phase at once or is incremental cell construction envisioned?

A meeting was held on September 29, 1994 betweenh Mike Sanchez of Mckim & Creed and Ed Mussler of the Solid Waste Section. Many of the particulars for this portion of the application were verbally reviewed then. If there are any questions, please contact us for guidance. Among the topics discussed were the conceptual facility drawings identifying all the phases, and adjustment to the size and scale, and what to make sure is included in the drawings.

Equipment Requirements §.1619(e)(1)(D)

What equipment is currently owned and operated by the county?

Total Operating Capacity

The total operating capacity for the entire facility should be identified, by phase. Final contours for all cells must be on the drawings. Phases six through eight must be conceptually designed, to identify the likely total waste disposed of on-site, and to identify the estimated life of the site.

Available Soil Resources from On-Site Sources and Required Soil Quantities

Stock pile areas and borrow areas, including proposed cuts must be included in the facility plan drawings. Is the 590,000 cubic yards of soil just from phase five or is it from the entire facility? If it is just from the first phase what will be done with the excess soil? The report says that low permeability soils are generally absent on the site. What plans are being made to amend the soil or obtain suitable soils from off site for the construction, and how much off-site or amended soils may be needed? What are the estimated quantities of soils needed for total landfill construction, operation, and closure? Will soils be obtained from a future phase to construct or operate a preceding phase?

Pretreatment Unit-

Mr. C.T. Clayton
October 5, 1994
Page 5

Any lagoon used for the storage and /or treatment of leachate must have a composite liner system. See § .1680 for leachate storage requirements. What pretreatment is anticipated for the leachate?

Final Cap System

The conceptual cap system must include a geomembrane, or be an alternative design which is demonstrated to be equal to the required cap. See § .1627(c)(1) for cap design requirements.

Erosion and Sediment Control

Are terraces planned for the final cap system, to break the long flow plane on the side slopes of the closed landfill?

Estimated Operating Life of the Proposed Landfill

What is the estimated life of phases 6,7, and 8? What will be done if they are not five years?

When submitting revisions to the site study, the changed pages should be clearly identified with a revision date in either a footer or a header. It is not necessary to submit five copies of revisions or facility drawings, at this time. Two copies will suffice. When the site study is finalized and there are no more changes, then a total of five copies will be needed. These comments are intended to expedite the review of the referenced application, and in no way do they restrict the Section's right to request additional information following the technical review process.

Thank you for your prompt attention. We are available by phone or fax to help clarify this letter and expedite the review of the application.

Sincerely,

Edward F. Mussler, III E.I.T
Environmental Engineer
Solid Waste Section

fm/EFM

cc: Haywood Phthisic, Johnston County Director of Utilities
Terry Dover Bob Harding
Jim Coffey Jim Barber File

FAX COVER SHEET

DIVISION OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SOLID WASTE SECTION

DATE: October 5, 1994

TO: Mike Sanchez, McKim & Creed

FAX NO: 233.8031

FROM: Ed Mussler

PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET) 6

Mike, here is a draft copy of the engineering technical review for the Johnston County Site application. If there are any questions please contact me today. The final version will be mailed out tomorrow.

Thanks,



Ed

IF YOU HAVE NOT RECEIVED ALL OF THE PAGES INDICATED, OR IF THE TRANSMISSION IS INCOMPLETE, PLEASE CALL (919) 733-0692.

FAX RESPONSE NUMBER- (919) 733-4810

Residential Subdivisions -

Approximately how many homes are in the subdivision? Are there any homes in the area that are not part of the subdivision? What is their water supply?

Waste Transportation Routes-

Is there one or more transportation routes which handles the bulk of the traffic? What is it? Is the road considered adequate for the nature of the traffic using it?

Local characterization study .1618(c)(2)

The local characterization study must include report and a map (.1618(c)(2)). This study needs a summary report of the items discussed in this section. The report should characterize the local area and identify things like the proposed disposal site and any easements, existing land use and zoning of the site and the surrounding properties, other potential sources of contamination, and the existing features of the site as identified in .1618(c)(2)(G), and other factors which would show suitability for this site as a Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Facility (MSWLF).

Aerial Photograph-

The reproduction of the aerial photograph is too dark to allow proper use and to identify the physical characteristics of the site such that a proper correlation between the map and the features can be made. The aerial should be marked with a legend, scale, and North arrow. The property boundary and the 2000 foot radius should also be included. It would be useful to also identify the local area study items of interest as listed in the rule. Pertinent existing topography features such as flood plains and wetlands should also be delineated.

Existing Land Use and Zoning-

Does the County own any additional land immediately adjacent to the proposed site, in any direction? Does the county control any of the property across the creeks?

Private Residences and Schools-

Do any of the residences have wells within 500 feet of the landfill?

Other Sources of Contamination-

The existing landfill should be identified as a source of contamination, as well as commenting on any known or suspected path of travel, whether or not it is felt that the existing contamination will affect the new proposed site, and can the site be adequately monitored to detect the source of contamination. Is there an underground storage tank on the existing site? Where are the land application fields, and could they impact the proposed site?

Potable wells and well documentation-

In the absence of well completion data on the surrounding wells, information should be gathered on typical well installation in the area. In particular the common size, depth and yield should be obtained. Local well drillers could be a source of this information. What is the resource value of the underlying aquifer?

Existing Topography-

Please provide a copy of the flood map used to identify the floodplain.

Site Hydrogeologic Report .1618(c)(3)

This review letter only addresses the engineering portions of the site application. A technical review of the hydrogeologic report will be submitted under separate cover by the Section Hydrogeologist.

Location Restrictions .1618(c)(4) (which refers to §.1622)

Floodplain-

Please provide a copy of the referenced FEMA map.

Wetlands-

It is advisable that the wetland delineation be included on the property survey plat and properly signed off by them.

State Nature and Historic Preserve-

The demonstration listed under this category more appropriately addresses Cultural Resources, §.1622(7). Is any of the land of the proposed site included in the State Nature and Historic Preserve?

Cultural Resources §.1622(7)-

Was the cultural resource study that was done and completed in June of 1994 submitted to the agency, and do they concur with the findings of the consultant?

Unstable Areas-

What are the expected soil characteristics and soil strength of the underlying soils and what type of settlements are anticipated. What measures will be taken during the next phase to identify particular soil characteristics needed to properly engineer the system? Are there any anticipated limits to a MSWLF that preliminary soil information has revealed?

Local government approval §.1618(c)(5)

The final local government resolution and minutes of the meeting need to be forwarded to the Section. Is there documentation that the public service announcements that were placed with radio and TV were actually run.

Proposed Facility Plan §.1618(c)(6)

The conceptual plan for the entire facility must be presented. The written report should include a summary of the finding and also include the findings of the geologic report. Of importance is to identify all the activities proposed for the site, a description of the site both topographically and geologically, and any possible limitations or obstacles to overcome. Detailed engineering plans and facility plans will be prepared for the first phase of development during the next phase of the permitting process. The facility drawings for this plan must identify, conceptually, all of the phases, cell locations, final contours, etc (see the requirements of §.1619 (d) & (e). Is it planned to construct the entire phase at once or is incremental cell construction envisioned?

A meeting was held on September 29, 1994 betweenh Mike Sanchez of Mckim & Creed and Ed Mussler of the Solid Waste Section. Many of the particulars for this portion of the application were verbally reviewed then. If there are any questions, please contact us for guidance. Among the topics discussed were the conceptual facility drawings identifying all the phases, and adjustment to the size and scale, and what to make sure is included in the drawings.

Equipment Requirements §.1619(e)(1)(D)

What equipment is currently owned and operated by the county?

Total Operating Capacity

The total operating capacity for the entire facility should be identified, by phase. Final contours for all cells must be on the drawings. Phases six through eight must be conceptually designed, to identify the likely total waste disposed of on-site, and to identify the estimated life of the site.

Available Soil Resources from On-Site Sources and Required Soil Quantities

Stock pile areas and borrow areas, including proposed cuts must be included in the facility plan drawings. Is the 590,000 cubic yards of soil just from phase five or is it from the entire facility? If it is just from the first phase what will be done with the excess soil? The report says that low permeability soils are generally absent on the site. What plans are being made to amend the soil or obtain suitable soils from off site for the construction, and how much off-site or amended soils may be needed? What are the estimated quantities of soils needed for total landfill construction, operation, and

closure? Will soils be obtained from a future phase to construct or operate a preceding phase?

Pretreatment Unit-

Any lagoon used for the storage and /or treatment of leachate must have a composite liner system. See § .1680 for leachate storage requirements. What pretreatment is anticipated for the leachate?

Final Cap System

The conceptual cap system must include a geomembrane, or be an alternative design which is demonstrated to be equal to the required cap. See § .1627(c)(1) for cap design requirements.

Erosion and Sediment Control

Are terraces planned for the final cap system, to break the long flow plane on the side slopes of the closed landfill?

Estimated Operating Life of the Proposed Landfill

What is the estimated life of phases 6,7, and 8? What will be done if they are not five years?

When submitting revisions to the site study, the changed pages should be clearly identified with a revision date in either a footer or a header. It is not necessary to submit five copies of revisions or facility drawings, at this time. Two copies will suffice. When the site study is finalized and there are no more changes, then a total of five copies will be needed. These comments are intended to expedite the review of the referenced application, and in no way do they restrict the Section's right to request additional information following the technical review process.

Thank you for your prompt attention. We are available by phone or fax to help clarify this letter and expedite the review of the application.

Sincerely,

Edward F. Mussler, III E.I.T
Environmental Engineer
Solid Waste Section

fm/EFM

cc: Haywood Phthisic, Johnston County Director of Utilities
Terry Dover Bob Harding
Jim Coffey Jim Barber File

DRAFT

October 4, 1994

Mr. C.T. Clayton
McKim & Creed Engineers, PA
5625 Dillard Road Suite 117
Cary, NC 27511

RE: Technical Review, Johnston County Subtitle D Landfill Site Application

Dear Mr. Clayton,

Johnston County proposes to establish a MSWLF facility not previously permitted by the Division of Solid Waste Management (the Division). Rule .1603 (a)(1), of the NC Solid Waste Management Rules (15A NCAC 13B .1600), directs that a site study shall be submitted, and subsequently, an application for a permit to construct as set forth in Paragraph (a) of Rule .1617. The site study requirements are found in Rule .1618, Site Study for MSWLF Facilities.

The Solid Waste Section (the Section) is performing a technical review on the engineering portion of the site application submitted by McKim & Creed, on behalf of Johnston County. This review involves evaluating the Johnston County site application with respect to the NC Solid Waste Management Rules, 15A NCAC 13B .1618. The following information must be submitted to the Section so that we may continue the review process.

Regional characterization study .1618(c)(1)

The regional characterization study must include a report and a map (.1618(c)(1)). This study needs a summary report of the items discussed in this section. The report should characterize the region and identify items such as where the landfill is physically, in relation to an urban area, what the general land use surrounding the landfill is, and other factors which would show suitability for this site as a Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Facility (MSWLF).

Public Water Supply Wells-

Is there a groundwater divide separating the two downgradient public water supply wells?

What is the size and yield of the closet wells?

Are there any surface water intakes nearby?