



Montana Solid Waste News



Spring 2012



IT'S SPRING AGAIN!

Kathy O'Hern

You might recall that the spring of 2011 was a wet one in Montana. Heavy snowfalls, coupled with freakish warm temperatures early in February, led to premature snowmelts. Along came more freezing temperatures that caused major ice jams. More rain, and spring snowmelts, resulted in lots of flooding and lots of mud during May and June.

Like others, Solid Waste operations in Montana suffered from the rain and flooding. At one landfill a portion of a newly-constructed cell liner slid and ripped. The repairs were costly, and couldn't even be started for several months while the soil dried out.

Another landfill was forced to close a main access road after several garbage trucks, and equipment, slid off and got stuck in the mud. For a number of weeks the incoming trash was diverted to a holding area to eventually be moved to the active cell when the ground dried – nothing like double-handling.

I saw eight, maybe ten, landfill roads being repaired from damage caused by flooding or rain during the course of my summer inspection travels.

This year the conditions are dryer, so operations will have relief from flooding. But what will happen instead? There may yet be rains coming, maybe an earthquake or fire, excess flies or mosquitoes, stronger than normal winds – who knows! Stay tuned because life in Solid Waste is never dull!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

It's Spring Again!	1
Solid Waste Program Staff.....	1
Upcoming Solid Waste Trainings.....	2
Methane Monitoring for Dummies	3-4
Question from a Solid Waste Facility	4
Farewell to Pat Crowley	4
Management of Oil & Gas Wastes	5-8
Solid Waste Industry News	9
Webinar for Landfill Operators	9
Jury orders landfill owner to pay \$2.3M in damages	9
Groups Sue EPA Over Coal Ash Waste Inaction	9
Deaths 'a wake-up call' for Composters	10
EPA: Landfill Methane Emissions Down 27%	10
Rule Would Ban Landfilling Commercial Food.....	11

Solid Waste Program Staff

Rick Thompson, Section Supervisor,
444-5345

Mary Louise Hendrickson, Technical
Lead, 444-1808

Bruce Meyer, Junk Vehicle Program
Manager, 444-2835

Tim Stepp, Environmental Engineer,
444-4725

Mitzi Hansen, Data Control
Specialist, 444-3493

Martin Van Oort, SW Inspector
specializing in groundwater and
methane monitoring, 444-2802

Kathy O'Hern, SW Inspector
specializing in recycling and
composting, 444-9879

Bob McWilliams, SW Inspector
specializing in the Septic Pumper
Program, 444-1434

Carda Taylor
Junk Vehicle Program, 444-3048



Address:

Lee Metcalf Building
1520 East Sixth Ave.
PO Box 200901

Main Line 444-5300

<http://deq.mt.gov/SolidWaste>

UPCOMING SOLID WASTE TRAININGS



Compost Operator Training

June 19-21, 2012, Helena

Montana Association of Counties (MACo) Building

JEAN BONHOTAL, INSTRUCTOR

Jean has worked at the Cornell Waste Management Institute in solid waste education for over 20 years. She is an expert on composting using a variety of feedstocks – from food to manure to animal carcasses.

Tuesday June 19, 2012, 8am – 5pm

Compost Basics

- Introduction, course overview
- Compost need and value – why compost?
- Environment, SW reduction, agriculture

Operations

- Basics – water, safety, size, recipe
- Collection, systems and methods
- Site selection – neighbors
- Pad surfaces – impact on quality
- Equipment and impact on quality
- Testing and consistency of product over time
- Worker Health and safety – Public health and safety – working with neighbors
- Troubleshooting – water, resistant herbicides, odors
- Marketing the Finished Product

Wednesday June 20, 2012, 8am – 5pm

Operations continued

- Special “feed stocks” – biosolids, animal mortality composting, food residuals
- Montana Regulations
- Overview of Montana Composting
- Economics of Composting
- Developing a composting plan
- Value of on-site composting

A site visit to the Lewis & Clark County Landfill’s Compost Operation will include instructions on:

- Moisture testing
- Temperatures
- Aeration Systems
- Safety
- Run-on/run-off
- Collecting samples for testing

Compost Training continued

Thursday, June 21, 2012, 9am – noon.

On Thursday the focus will shift to home composting. Sometimes hauling organics doesn’t make sense because of distance and/or transportation costs. The organic materials generated at home can still be diverted from the landfill, though, by backyard composting.

The public will be invited to attend this portion of the compost training. This session will be devoted to small-scale operations and safety.

A few different types of backyard bins will be built using readily available building materials such as wooden pallets, chicken wire, t-posts, etc. Samples of commercial small-scale bins will be on site.

12 SWANA CEUs are allocated for this training

For more information and registration instructions:

<https://app.mt.gov/confreq2/index.html>

E-waste and Household Hazardous Waste Collections

September 12, 2012

A variety of toxic household hazardous waste (HHW) and electronic items (e-waste) are hauled to our landfills and transfer stations daily. But how does a solid waste operation go about diverting them from the waste stream?

Learn how one small Montana community implemented a successful e-waste program. Jackie Couture from Sidney, Montana, will go over the steps that they took to implement an on-going e-waste collection program.

In addition, Bridget Kelley from PSC Environmental will talk about HHW Collection programs; and provide hands-on instructions for dealing with a variety of common household chemicals.

This four-hour training will be held at the Holiday Inn in Bozeman in conjunction with the Economy, Energy and Environment Conference. Details will be posted on DEQ’s website when confirmed.

Additional information about these, and other, trainings is located on the [SWP Training](#) page.

METHANE MONITORING FOR DUMMIES

Martin Van Oort

Administrative Rule of Montana (ARM) 17.50.1106 contains the rules for explosive gas control at Class II landfill, but what do these rules mean from a practical view? Here's a simple overview of the equipment, techniques, and issues involved in methane monitoring.

Landfill gas is formed as a byproduct of bacteria breaking down organic matter in the waste and consists primarily of methane (CH₄) and carbon dioxide (CO₂), with trace amounts of carbon monoxide (CO), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and various volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Because of its explosive potential, methane is the primary concern. Methane is lighter than air and tends to migrate upwards and escape to the atmosphere; however, landfill gas as a whole can range from lighter to heavier than air, making its movement unpredictable. Many factors affect the movement of landfill gas including landfill design and operations, geology and soil type, landfill gas temperature, soil moisture content, frozen ground and snow cover, and even air temperature and barometric pressure.

Methane is measured as either percent by volume or as percent of the lower explosive limit (LEL). The LEL is the smallest percent of methane in air which can explode, and is 5% by volume. Thus, 5% methane by volume equals to 100% of the LEL. A variety of instruments can be used to measure methane. The simplest instruments measure only percent LEL, and sometimes also oxygen (O₂). Others measure total methane or LEL plus O₂, CO, and H₂S. Some also measure nitrogen (N₂), the dominant component of air. The most commonly used instruments measure total methane, O₂, and CO₂.

The standards for methane at landfills have two components as described in ARM 17.50.1106(1)(a) & (b). According to (a) methane may not exceed 25% of the LEL in facility structures, and according to (b) methane may not exceed the LEL at the facility property boundary. Monitoring in facility structures is simply a matter of taking methane readings in the structure. Sometimes measurements are also taken in crawlspaces, scales, floor drains, sumps, culverts, or other areas where landfill gas may accumulate.

Methane at landfill property boundaries is typically monitored using soil gas probes. The depth and locations of these probes vary, based on site

specific features. The number of probes required and their locations, construction, and depths are approved by the DEQ as part of the facility methane monitoring plan. The methane monitoring plan also should describe the frequency of monitoring and the procedures used during monitoring. The methane monitoring plan for a facility should be reviewed at least every five years and updated as necessary.

Because landfill gas can move in any direction, probes are typically placed on all sides of the landfill. For larger facilities there may be multiple probes on each side of the facility, generally spaced 500 to 1000 feet apart. In some cases the facility property boundary may be far enough removed from the waste unit, that probes may not be required on all sides of a facility. While the probes can vary greatly in design, they typically consist of a slotted PVC pipe in a boring and surrounded by gravel. A solid PVC pipe extends to above the surface of the ground and is fitted with a sealed cap and in some cases a monitoring port. In general, probes extend to the maximum depth of the adjacent waste unit, and are slotted from the bottom to within about five feet of the surface. In some cases two or three probes are slotted at multiple depths in the same location to monitor discrete permeable zones.

Monitoring at landfills is conducted at least quarterly. For larger facilities, facilities in populated areas, or facilities with a history of methane standard exceedances, monthly monitoring may be required. Monitoring at a probe is typically conducted one of two ways. For probes with a monitoring port, the gas intake for the instrument is connected to the port and the port is opened. For probes without a port, the cap is opened and the intake for the instrument is inserted into the probe while the top of the probe is sealed in some fashion. In both cases the pump on the instrument is then operated to purge the probe until the gas readings stabilize. The stabilized readings are recorded, along with any other relevant information which may include length of purge, initial spikes in methane which dissipated, weather information, and any issues with probe condition.

The results of the methane monitoring event must be reported to the DEQ. If a concentration of methane exceeding the standards for buildings or the property boundary is detected, ARM 17.50.1106(4) describes the necessary actions, which include immediate protection of human health, documentation of the exceedance in the operating record within 7 days, and preparation of a remediation plan within 60 days. Detection of methane in a building is rare, but is a serious human health threat and requires immediate correction,

typically by installing a ventilation system and continuous monitoring devices with alarms.

In most cases the initial response to a methane exceedance at the property boundary probes is a verification measurement within one month. Monthly monitoring typically continues until methane concentrations return to levels below the LEL. Depending on the frequency, duration, and concentration of methane exceedances at a facility,

some type of gas control system may be necessary to maintain compliance with the LEL standard. For smaller facilities or lower methane concentrations, passive gas vents may effectively lower methane to safe levels. For more serious methane issues, larger facilities, or facilities in populated areas, an active gas extraction system may be necessary to maintain methane concentration below the LEL at the property boundary.

QUESTION FROM A SOLID WASTE FACILITY



Question: Recent bed bug infestations in a few Montana communities has caused concern among waste haulers who collect and transport infested mattresses and other furniture to the landfill. Do hotels or motels have to report bed bug infestations to the State? Are there any rules or guidance available for the management or disposal of bed bug infested materials?

Answer: The Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services licenses and regulates hotels, motels, B&B's, tourist homes and other public accommodations in the state. However, because there are no communicable diseases associated with bed bugs, these facilities do not have to report infestations. Bed bugs aren't typically considered a medical or public health hazard – they don't spread disease. They can be an annoyance because their presence (and sometimes even their mention) may cause itching and loss of sleep. Excessive itching can lead to excessive scratching that can sometimes increase the chance of a secondary skin infection. Laboratory studies show that the insect is incapable of infecting its host and the bugs don't stay on a person.

The DEQ does not have specific requirements for the management of bed bug infested materials. However, a quick search of the internet reveals several good resources on the subject. These are a FEW of them:

- The New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene document outlining the proper disposal of bed bug infested household items: <http://www.nyc.gov/html/doh/bedbugs/downloads/pdf/bed-bugs-disposal.pdf>
- The USEPA's bed bug information website provides information on how to identify these pesky bugs and how to treat infestations: <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/bedbugs/#signs>
- A Cornell University publication on the New York State's Integrated Pest Management website that includes information on bed bug identification: http://www.nysipm.cornell.edu/publications/bb_guidelines/files/bb_guidelines_bbID.pdf
- Bed Bugs 101: <http://www.afpmb.org/sites/default/files/whatsnew/2006/harlan.pdf>

So, what can landfills do to address the concerns the haulers have with collecting the infested mattresses? Consider establishing clear disposal guidelines that you can send out to the hotels and motels within your service area. This way, they will know what they need to do to ensure the items are removed by the hauler or your collection crews, instead of being left outside by the dumpster or alleyway. You might also establish some simple handling guidelines for your employees so they recognize that they don't have to be concerned about whether or not they risk an infestation themselves. Are you itchy now?

Submit your question to kohern@mt.gov



FAREWELL TO PAT

Upon hearing the sad news that former colleague Pat Crowley had passed away, talk turned to Pat's unique personality. Comments included the words: loud, energetic, funny, irritating, boisterous, happy, smart, and many, many more. And, of course, when talking about Pat you have to include fishing, gardening and rocks. He was one interesting man, and he will be missed!

MANAGEMENT OF OIL AND GAS WASTES

Mary Louise Hendrickson

Has your facility been approached by oil companies or drill rig operators concerning the disposal of wastes generated from oil and gas activities? Do you know what you need to do before you can accept these waste streams for management at your site? The following discussion should help you determine whether to accept these wastes at your site and what is required before you do.

The recent resurgence in the development of oil and gas resources in Montana and neighboring states has resulted in numerous inquiries to the Solid Waste Program on the requirements for landfill management of wastes associated with the development of these resources. These wastes are commonly referred to as exploration and production, or E&P, wastes. In 1980, Congress exempted specific E&P waste streams uniquely associated with the exploration, development or production of crude oil or natural gas from regulation under RCRA Subtitle C as a hazardous waste. However, this RCRA Subtitle C exemption does not preclude the regulation of these wastes under the current state solid waste or other federal regulations.

First things first...

At the present time, the exempted and non-hazardous E&P wastes are regulated in Montana as a "Special Waste". As defined in 75-10-802(8), Montana Code Annotated (MCA), "*Special waste*" means solid waste that has unique handling, transportation, or disposal requirements to ensure protection of the public health, safety, and welfare and the environment. Because these are unique wastes generated during oil and gas E&P activities that will exhibit a certain amount of variability due to the various drilling and recovery methods used, there are specific waste management requirements.

What does this mean to you?

Before you bring any of these wastes through the gate, the first thing you need to do, if you haven't already done so, is to submit an update to your facility O&M Plan to the Solid Waste Program for approval.

What sort of information do you need to include in the update? The O&M Plan should detail the types of wastes you will accept, how these wastes will be managed on site, whether or not you plan a separate management area, the criteria to exclude the receipt of certain wastes (ie., maximum contaminant concentrations and/or waste types, etc...), and how waste characteristics will be verified and tracked.

What are the waste characterization requirements?

All licensed solid waste management facilities must document the initial characterization of the E&P waste prior to acceptance and management on site. The initial characterization criteria include:

- Generator information;
- Identification of the waste source location, volume, physical state, and type;
- Identification of the process producing the waste;
- Method of receipt; and,
- Contaminant concentrations.

As an aside, because these wastes may also contain naturally-occurring radioactive material (NORM) as well as technologically enhanced naturally-occurring radioactive material (TENORM) constituents, the updated O&M Plan must also include the criteria for acceptance and the procedures for the management of the NORM and TENORM wastes.

To facilitate the collection samples for waste characterization, the E&P waste generator must collect at least 1 composite sample that consists of 5 sub-samples per 200 cubic yards of contaminated material from the same contaminant source and analyze for the list of constituents in Table 1.

<p>Table 1: E&P Waste Characterization Requirements</p> <p>Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons by EPA Method 8015(C10-C36) <u>and either</u> Gasoline Range Organics (GRO) by 8015 or Total Purgeable Hydrocarbons (C6 to C10) by 8015;</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-OR instead of the above-</p> <p>Total Extractable Hydrocarbons (C9–C36) by EPH Massachusetts Method <u>and</u> Total Purgeable Hydrocarbons (C5-C12) by VPH Massachusetts Method</p> <p>Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) by Method 8270 (in accordance with the Department's RBCA guidance Table 1, Tier 1 Surface Soils RBSL's)</p> <p>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) by Method 8260b</p> <p>Toxicity Characteristics Leaching Procedure (TCLP) Metals</p> <p>TCLP Benzene</p> <p>Reactive Sulfide</p> <p>Flash Point</p> <p>pH</p> <p>Paint Filter Liquids Test</p> <p>Total Chloride and Specific Conductance</p> <p>Radium-226, Radium-228, Lead-210 for unprocessed E&P wastes. Radium-226, Radium-228, Lead-210, Thorium-232 and Polonium-210 for processed E&P wastes</p>

What are the acceptance criteria for licensed facilities?

The acceptance criteria for disposal at licensed Class II landfills is based upon the characteristics of the E&P waste relevant to the various Class II unit design and monitoring elements unique to each facility. Table 2 provides the design criteria relevant to the waste characteristics for disposal of E&P waste into Class II landfills.

Table 2: Waste Management/Disposal Criteria*	
Landfill Design Requirements	E&P Waste Limits
Leachate Collection and Removal System and Synthetic Liner	(TPH+GRO) or (TPH+Total Purgeables) equal to <50,000 mg/kg Ra-226 + Ra-228 <30 pCi/gm
No Leachate Collection System and Engineered clay ** or Synthetic Liner	(TPH+GRO) or (TPH+Total Purgeables) equal to < 50,000 mg/kg Chloride <5,000 mg/kg Ra-226 + Ra-228 <15pCi/gm
Natural clay liner***	(TPH+GRO) or (TPH+Total Purgeables) equal to < 50,000 mg/kg Chloride < 3,000 mg/kg Ra-226 + Ra-228 <15pCi/gm

Class II facilities must maintain the necessary surface water run-on/run-off control systems and are located in areas with suitable hydrogeology, and may or may not be required to perform groundwater monitoring.

*Exceptions to the limitations provided herein may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

**Engineered clay liner consists of a clay liner constructed of appropriate clayey material where the material is

laid down in 6-inch lifts and each lift is compacted at 2-3% wet of optimum moisture to achieve a hydraulic conductivity of 10⁻⁷ cm/sec or less.

***Natural clay liner is a liner constructed by scarifying and recompacting the native clay material in which the landfill unit is built.

Can the E&P wastes be landfarmed?

Exempted E&P wastes that exhibit one or more characteristics of hazardous wastes may not be landfarmed. However, the treatment of non-hazardous E&P wastes and 'non-hazardous exhibiting' exempt E&P wastes by landfarming is acceptable at licensed Class II landfills, as long as landfarming is an activity approved by licensure, and management of these wastes at the landfarm is addressed in the approved facility O&M Plan. Landfarms established solely for remediation of E&P wastes are also an option, but must be licensed prior to the acceptance of these wastes for treatment.

What sort of waste materials might be encountered at licensed facilities? What are the exemptions and the testing requirements for these different waste materials?

Table 3 provides a listing of common E&P waste materials, the respective RCRA exemption status, testing requirements, and requirements for approval prior to disposal.

Table 3*: Common E&P Waste Materials			
Description of Waste Item	Exempt per 40 CFR Part 261.4(b)(5)**	MT DEQ Approval Required prior to Disposal / Other Options	Required Testing or Recommended Treatment
Asbestos-containing material	No – subject to specific regulations	Approval per O&M Plan	Comply with state and federal rules for removal and disposal
Bags (empty) paper	No	No	None
Land clearing vegetative debris, uncontaminated	No	No	None
Buckets, detergent (empty)	No	No	None
Buckets, grease (empty)	No	No	None
Concrete, contaminated from compressor stations, oil, or gas facilities	No	Yes	Test for contaminants of concern on case-by-case
Concrete, uncontaminated	No	No	None
Containers, empty	No	No	None
Drill cuttings	Yes	Yes	Table 1 analytes
Barrels, drums, 5-gallon buckets (empty)	No	No	None
Fiberglass tanks & pipe (empty)	No	No	Clean, cut, or shred
Filters – amine, dehydration, glycol	Yes	Yes	TPH, TCLP Benzene,
Filters – cooling tower	Yes (No, if generated in transportation)	Yes	Total Chromium
Filters – saltwater	Yes	Yes	TPH, pH, Chlorides, NORM
Filters – waste oil (1) entire unit is inside metal container	No	Yes	Separate parts, recycle oil and metal parts
Filters – waste oil (2) replaceable fiber or paper filter inside unit	No	Yes	Total Lead and Benzene
Iron sponge	Yes	Yes	Allow to oxidize completely to prevent combustion
Office trash, routine	No	No	None
Metal plates, pipes, cable	No	No	None, recycle
Molecular sieves	Yes	Yes	TPH, Total Benzene
Muds – drilling	Yes	Yes	Table 1 analytes
Muds – sacks of unused drilling mud	No	Yes	Return to vendor or use at other sites
Muds – unused additives	No	Yes	Return to vendor or use at other sites
“Pigging waste” from gathering line in primary field operations	Yes	Yes	Table 1 analytes
“Pigging waste” from transmission lines	No	Yes	Table 1 analytes
Pipe scale & other deposits removed from piping and equipment	Yes (No, if generated in transportation)	Yes	TPH, RCRA Metals, NORM

Table 3*: Common E&P Waste Materials - continued

Pipe dope, unused	No	Yes	Review MSDS for lead, reuse
Plastic pit liners	Yes	Yes	Decontaminate, test for TPH, NORM
Pumps, valves, etc...	No	Yes	NORM
Rags and gloves, used	No	No	None
Sand – produced during exploration	Yes	Yes	Table 1 analytes
Soil – containing crude oil hydrocarbon	Yes (No, if generated in transportation)	Yes	RCRA Metals, TPH, Chlorides, NORM
Soil – containing lube oil hydrocarbons	No	Yes	RCRA Metals, PCB's, TPH
Sulfur – ferrous elemental sulfur and soil contaminated with sulfur	No	Yes	Recover elemental sulfur – case-by-case
Sorbent pads – crude oil and exempt wastes	Yes	Yes	RCRA Metals, TPH, Chlorides, Benzene
Sorbent pads – lube oil and other non-exempt wastes	No	Yes	RCRA Metals, TPH, Benzene
Tank seals – rubber	No	Yes	Drain, recycle
Tower packing	No	Yes	Chromium
Water-treatment backwash solids	Yes	Yes	RCRA Metals, NORM
Wooden pallets, uncontaminated	No	No	No

*Adapted from: Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Waste Permits Division, Regulatory Guidance RG-003, September, 2006

**40 CFR Part 261.4(b) *Solid wastes which are not hazardous wastes*. The following solid wastes are not hazardous wastes:

(5) Drilling fluids, produced waters, and other wastes associated with the exploration, development, or production of crude oil, natural gas or geothermal energy.

One last thing...

Since most licensed Class II facilities are operated primarily for the disposition of municipal waste, some planning and adjustment will likely be necessary for effective use of the landfill's capacity*. In addition, facility plans and/or operations must be examined to determine the necessary changes based upon the receipt and management of these wastes at your facility:

- For facilities required to monitor ground water, an update to the facility Ground Water Monitoring Plan to include the analysis of radionuclides;
- The facility's approved Financial Assurance mechanism must be reviewed to ensure the approved mechanism is adequately funded for closure, post-closure, and corrective action;
- The facility's Closure Construction and Post-Closure Monitoring Plans must be updated as necessary to ensure the closure design, post-closure monitoring, and the closure/post-closure cost projections adequately address any changes due to the acceptance and management of these wastes;
- Modifications of the facility size classification may be necessary based upon the anticipated volume of these wastes the facility receives for management;
- Modification of the facility O&M Plan for receipt and management of E&P wastes as special wastes that include a plan to monitor and manage ionizing radiation.

These elements of operation should all be considerations before deciding whether or not to add this E&P waste stream to your list of acceptable wastes. Since the volume of E&P wastes may outpace the normal volume of municipal solid waste the facility receives, acceptance of these wastes could very well shorten the remaining life of the facility. Finally, even if the characteristics of the exempted and the non-hazardous E&P wastes are appropriate for disposal at licensed Class II landfills, it is the facility owner/operators decision as to whether or not they will accept this non-municipal waste.

**Facilities needing to expand their current operations either outside their approved landfill footprint, or outside their current license boundary, must initiate the necessary expansion applications as soon as practical. These reviews may take several months to complete. For more information contact Mary Louise Hendrickson, 406-444-1808*

SOLID WASTE INDUSTRY NEWS

WEBINAR FOR LANDFILL OPERATORS - THE SCIENCE OF DAILY CELL CONSTRUCTION

Daily cells are the basic building blocks of every landfill, and the performance of your landfill boils down to this one activity. But most cells are built according to tradition - not science. Which method do you use?

Every successful landfill manager must understand the science of cell construction. Attend this webinar and learn how to optimize cell construction for your landfill. When it comes to cell construction, getting it right can:

1. Increase waste compaction
2. Decrease equipment costs
3. Reduce soil usage
4. Minimize litter, birds, vectors and odors
5. Save airspace

The Science of Daily Cell Construction

\$125.00 to register

Wednesday, May 23, 2012

10 am – 11 am MST

[Register for this webinar](#)

If you have specific questions about the content of this webinar, please email Sarah Bolton, Marketing Manager at sarah@blueridgeservices.com

JURY ORDERS LANDFILL OWNER TO PAY \$2.3M IN DAMAGES

Jeremy Carroll, Waste & Recycling News

A federal jury has ordered the owner of a South Carolina landfill to pay \$2.3 million to six residents who say their lives have been made miserable by the stench from the 140-foot tall piles of trash. The jury award is rare since it requires the company to pay damages based on nuisance landfill odors that affect peoples' enjoyment of their property. An appeal is expected that will request a judge to throw out the award.

But a lawyer for the residents says he will ask the judge to close the landfill or order it to change how it operates at a hearing. During the two-week trial, people who lived near the landfill testified the smell is so bad at times they cannot stay outside.

Officials at the landfill say state regulators never had a problem with the odors.

Read the complete story at: <http://www.wasterecyclingnews.com/article/20120404/NEWS01/304049995>

GROUPS SUE EPA OVER COAL ASH WASTE INACTION

Allan Gerlat, Waste Age

San Francisco-based Earthjustice filed the suit on behalf of 11 other parties in the U.S. District Court of Columbia, intending to force the EPA to complete its rulemaking process and finalize public health safeguards against what Earthjustice characterizes as toxic coal ash. The agency has not updated its waste disposal and control standards for coal ash in more than 30 years, the group said in a news release.

Earthjustice said this is despite more evidence of leaking waste ponds, poisoned groundwater supplies and threats to public health. The groups said recent EPA data shows an additional 29 power plants in 16 states have contaminated groundwater near coal ash dump sites. Coal ash is a byproduct of coal-fired power plants.

Earthjustice is suing based on the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which requires the EPA to ensure that safeguards are updated to address any waste issues.

"It is well past time the EPA acts on promises made years ago to protect the nation from coal ash contamination and life-threatening coal ash ponds," said Earthjustice attorney Lisa Evans.

The plaintiffs identified in the suit are Appalachian Voices, Environmental Integrity Project, Chesapeake Climate Action Network, French Broad Riverkeeper, Kentuckians for the Commonwealth, Moapa Band of Paiutes, **Montana Environmental Information Center**, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Prairie Rivers Network, Sierra Club and Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

Read complete story at: http://waste360.com/environmental-protection-agency-epa/groups-sue-epa-over-coal-ash-waste-inaction?cid=nl_wire

DEATHS 'A WAKE-UP CALL' FOR COMPOSTERS

Shawn Wright, Waste & Recycling News

A California agency handed down stiff penalties six months after two men lost their lives at a composting operation. The California-Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) recently issued 16 citations totaling \$166,890 to Community Recycling & Resource Recovery Inc.'s facility in Lamont, Calif.

"This case should be a wake-up call for all kinds of facilities like this," Cal-OSHA Chief Ellen Widess said, "and things that really have to be taken into account before workers are put at risk. It is, of course, possible to do that."

The agency said Community Recycling neglected to set up safety procedures that could have saved 16-year-old Armando Ramirez and his 22-year-old brother Eladio Ramirez, after the two were overcome on Oct. 12 by lethal gases including hydrogen sulfide inside a drainage pipe on the company's property.

At the scene, emergency response teams did a direct reading of the drainage pipe's shaft. The instruments used to measure hydrogen sulfide topped out at 200 parts per million (ppm) of the lethal gas, according to documents released by Cal-OSHA. An acceptable ceiling limit for hydrogen sulfide in the workplace is 20 ppm, according to the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

"The numbers were off the chart for exposures," Widess said. "They exceeded the monitoring capability. We were able to confirm that right away."

Hydrogen sulfide is a common byproduct of the composting process, Cal-OSHA said, and the company should have initiated preventative measures for dealing with the gas. Widess said the deaths were completely preventable.

Read the complete story at: <http://www.wasterecyclingnews.com/article/20120409/NEWS01/304099993>

EPA: LANDFILL METHANE EMISSIONS DOWN 27% SINCE 1990

Jim Johnson, Waste & Recycling News

Municipal solid waste and industrial landfills have cut their methane emissions by more than 27 percent since 1990, but still remain the third-highest source of man-made greenhouse gases in the country.

Landfills generated 107.8 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2010, down from 147.7 million tons in 1990 and 111.2 million tons in 2009, according to a [new report](#) from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Both natural gas systems and enteric fermentation (methane generated by the digestive systems of ruminant animals such as cattle, sheep and goats) accounted for higher methane emissions last year, continuing a years-long trend, the agency reports.

"Our industry expects to continue reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the future, as additional investments are made to capture and destroy landfill gas," NSWMA President Bruce J. Parker said in a statement, "We're proud of this trend."

Landfills, the EPA said, produced approximately 16.2 percent of the manmade, or anthropogenic, methane emissions in the country in 2010.

Read the complete story at: <http://www.wasterecyclingnews.com/article/20120424/NEWS08/304249988/epa-landfill-methane-emissions-down-27-since-1990>

RULE WOULD BAN LANDFILLING COMMERCIAL FOOD WASTE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Jeremy Carroll, Waste & Recycling News

In an effort to preserve landfill space and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, officials in Massachusetts are preparing to ban hospitals, universities, hotels, large restaurants and other big businesses from tossing food waste into the trash, the Boston Globe reported.

The proposed rule is likely to be issued this summer but wouldn't take effect until 2014, the Globe reported. The goal is to divert one-third of the state's nearly 1.4 million tons of commercial food waste produced each year from the landfill to composting and anaerobic digestion facilities.

Advocates told the newspaper that sending commercial food waste to anaerobic digestion facilities would save money as tipping fees in Massachusetts averages between \$60 a ton to \$80 a ton.

State landfill capacity is expected to drop from about 2.1 million tons this year to about 600,000 tons by 2020, the newspaper reported.

Read the complete story at: <http://www.wasterecyclingnews.com/article/20120504/NEWS08/120509946/rule-would-ban-landfilling-commercial-food-waste-in-massachusetts>

Behold the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out.

~ James Conant

NEWSLETTER CONTACT

Send your questions or submissions
for upcoming issues to:

Kathy O'Hern
koern@mt.gov
406-444-9879