

7/12/05 Meeting Notes – Landfill Stability Workgroup
Raptor Conference Room – South Central Region Headquarters

website: <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/wm/solid/landfill/stability/index.htm>

Attending: Mike Dimaggio (Dane County), Gerard Hamblin (WMWI), Gene Mitchell (DNR), John Reindl (Dane County), Joe Van Rossum (UW-Extension/SHWEC), Brad Wolbert (DNR)

- I. Schedule: Gene Mitchell passed out a more detailed version of the tentative schedule. Key milestones include completing the Green Sheet for the Board hearing authorization request by January 23 (for the February 21-22 NRB meeting, as directed by the Board in March); request for approval of rules at the June NRB meeting; and November 1 as the effective date of the rule.
- II. Relationship with Financial Responsibility Workgroup: The FR workgroup is currently on a similar schedule for proposing rule changes (i.e., proposed rule to NRB at February 2006 meeting for hearing authorization). The stability code would not contain FR provisions; these would likely be in NR 520. We would possibly coordinate our efforts with those of the FR workgroup by providing milestones that represent when (a) risks, and (b) long-term care activities at the landfill are reduced due to organic stability efforts. The FR group would determine how to reduce the FR requirements accordingly. The group agreed on the wording of an email from Gene to the FR workgroup capturing these concepts.
- III. Guidance List: The group also briefly reviewed a list of guidance needs that have been discussed in previous meetings. These guidance efforts will require help from workgroup members. The list included (a) detailed stability plan contents; (b) how to analyze waste composition for purposes of the stability plans; (c) development of gas production curves; (d) a uniform data sheet for reporting measurements during plan implementation; and (e) considerations for evaluating reduced operation and maintenance requirements after the stability plan begins to show results. The group requested that a revised version of the list be distributed, to include the role of institutional controls under (e), and an additional guidance category (f) how to evaluate relative environmental impacts of diversion strategies.
- IV. Leachate Quality: Gene provided a one-page handout summarizing a sample set of expectations for the leachate quality goal of the stability plans. Leachate quality would be evaluated relative to surface water discharge standards in the receiving waterbody, and to groundwater standards at the relevant point of standards application taking attenuation, dilution, and degradation into account.
- V. Conceptual Rule Draft: The group discussed the 6/24/05 conceptual rule draft in detail. The group agreed on one initial clarification: the stability plan would not need to cover waste already in place at the time of plan approval, although it could (especially likely if there were incentives to do so). Other points made:
 - The initial analysis of waste composition will need additional guidance in order to be used as an estimate of the initial carbon loading.
 - Add acid/enzyme hydrolysis to the list of mechanical/biological treatment methods.

- The proposed requirement to compare the environmental impacts arising from management of diverted materials is problematic. This is not a study that any landfill operator can reasonably do, and we should recognize that landfill operators can divert waste anyway. It's better to assume that the diverted material is being managed in a way that meets applicable standards, and that if the standards need to be upgraded, the Department will do that. The counterargument is that standards for facilities receiving diverted waste are less stringent than for landfills, and by not requiring a comparison of impacts, the Department is endorsing a decision on organics that may increase environmental impacts. After much discussion the group decided not to require a comparison of environmental impacts, but to require instead a description from the landfill operator of where and how diverted materials are likely to be managed, for the benefit of the public.
- The presumptive measures are intended to be evaluated as a group, and all are needed for the goal of landfill organic stability plans to reflect likely stability. The statement that these goals are not enforceable standards should be moved forward for emphasis.
- Credit should be given for gas control that occurs within the final cover itself. To reach the gas goal, it might be necessary to follow this sequence: run the gas recovery system as long as possible, run the flare continuously, run the flare intermittently, and finally to rely on oxidation of methane within the cap, which may be engineered for this purpose.

DNR agreed to make the changes that were discussed, and to distribute a second draft of the conceptual rule for the group's review before it is shared with other Department staff and, later, with TAC members.

The next meeting was previously scheduled for August 16, 1:00, in the DNR-SCR Raptor Room.