



Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Central District
3319 Maguire Boulevard, Suite 232
Orlando, Florida 32803-3767

Charlie Crist
Governor

Jeff Kottkamp
Lt. Governor

Michael W. Sole
Secretary

By E-Mail
Aws97@aol.com

Mr. Gerald Laurencio
Friends Recycling, LLC
2350 N. W. 27th Avenue
Ocala, FL 34475

OCD-SW-08-0110

Marion County – SW
Friends Recycling, LLC – C&D Disposal & Recycling
Permit Application No. SO42-0019600-007
Comments about Complete Application

Dear Mr. Laurencio:

The additional information from Guerra Development Corporation, dated January 10, 2008 and received on January 29, 2008, was reviewed. Your application is considered complete. However, the Department does have concerns about some of the information submitted. These are discussed in Attachment 1.

The January 10, 2008 submittal proposed a new footprint for the disposal area. This affects the calculation of the closure and long term care costs estimates. Therefore, a new detailed cost estimate that accounts for the issues raised in Attachment 2 is necessary. Please submit the new estimate by March 21, 2008.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 407-893-3328.

Sincerely,

F. Thomas Lubozynski, P.E.
Waste Program Administrator

Date: March 7, 2008

FTL/ftl/ew

Attachments:

1. Department Concerns about Application Information
2. Issues to Address in Detailed Cost Estimate
3. January 18, 2008 e-mail, "RE: Friends Recycling OCD-SW-08-0040"

cc: Juan C. Guerra, P.E., Guerra Development Corp. guerracorp@att.net

Attachment 1: Department Concerns about Application Information

Guerra Development Corporation submitted a revised Engineer's Report dated January 10, 2008 to complete the application process. The following are concerns about information submitted throughout the permitting process.

1. A Certification of Construction Completion form was submitted for Cell 2. It was signed and sealed on October 19, 2007. During the permitting process the design of the disposal area has changed. Also, the area depicted as Cell 2 in the Certification of Construction Completion was not ready to receive waste materials. As stated in my letter to you dated November 21, 2007, this Certification of Construction Completion is not acceptable. A new certification must be submitted where Cell 2A is ready to receive waste. [As stated on Sheet 5 of 6, "Prior to receiving waste, Cell #2 (or portions thereof) shall be graded so the lowest bottom elevation is 64.00. Existing mounds of elevation may remain at elevations higher than 64.00."]
2. Groundwater Issues:
 - a. The information submitted indicates Hydrologic Associates U.S.A., Inc. (HAI) believes there is a perched, surficial aquifer at the site. This belief is not back by any evidence and goes against the conclusion in the HAI report, "Hydrogeological Investigation of Friends Recycling Construction and Demolition Debris Landfill Facility," dated December 2001. That report concludes the overlying sands "do not comprise a water bearing unit" (page 5). The groundwater monitoring plan that will be part of the permit is based on the ground water monitoring wells being placed in the Floridan aquifer.
 - b. The response to the Department's "Second Request for Additional Information," dated November 9, 2007 included a letter from HAI dated December 12, 2007. HAI concluded there has been no significant degradation of groundwater quality because "the exceedances of groundwater standards have not generally persisted at seriously high levels." This is not an acceptable way to interpret data. Any concentration higher than a standard is a concern. The exceedance does not have to be a certain multiple of the standard (such as, 2X or 10X) before it is a concern. Arsenic, phenol, and vinyl chloride standards have been exceeded at least twice consecutively in several monitoring wells.
 - c. The Engineer's Report indicated the HAI letter dated October 3, 2007 was a revised groundwater monitoring plan. That letter was reviewed previously and was not acceptable. The review comments were included in the "Second Request for Additional Information," dated November 9, 2007. The Department will stipulate the requirements in the groundwater monitoring plan.
 - d. The HAI letters dated December 12, 2007 were included in the recent RAI response. (One letter was addressed to Marjorie Heidorn; the other was addressed to F. Thomas Lubozynski.) The letters did respond to each Department comment. However, The Department was not favorably impressed with the hydrogeologic responses regarding interpretation of data and information for the Friends facility.

Attachment 2: Issues to Address in Detailed Cost Estimate

The revised Engineer's Report, dated January 10, 2008 (signed and sealed January 25, 2008), proposed a new footprint for the disposal facility and specific actions to prepare the site for eventual closure. Based on the submittals made during the permit application process the following must be accounted for in the detailed financial assurance cost estimate.

1. Cost values must be shown on DEP Form 62-701.900(28). Also, you will need to attach documents with the additional information requested below and any information used as a basis for the values submitted on the form.
2. Closure Cost Estimate:
 - a. Cost to move the waste in sub-cells 1B, 2B, and 2C into one of the areas permitted to accept waste material (that is Cells 1 or 2A). The cost estimate must indicate the volume of waste to be moved and the basis for that volume calculation.
 - b. Cost to construct properly sloped sides for the north and west slopes of Cell 1 and the west slope of Cell 2A. The current waste boundary can remain, but cannot be expanded.
 - i. The cost estimate must show all assumptions and give a basis for each assumption. You must assume that a third party has to perform the work using materials brought from offsite.
 - ii. The calculations to determine the volume of fill needed to construct the side slopes must be shown.
 - iii. Clean debris may be used to establish the side slopes. The basis for the cost of obtaining the clean debris must be stated.
 - iv. The final 2 feet of cover must be soil with the top 6 inches capable of supporting vegetation.
 - v. The lateral extent of the side slopes must account for the eventual final elevation (not to exceed 130 feet NGVD) of the disposal area.
 - c. Cost to construct the storm water control system required by the St Johns River Water Management District or other applicable permits.
 - d. Cost to provide the final two feet of cover over the top and sides of the revised disposal area (Cell 1 at 14.5 acres, Cell 1B for clean Debris at 0.4 acre, Cell 2A at 12.3 acres, and Cell 2C for clean debris at 0.9 acres).
 - i. This must include the grading work to ensure the side slopes are no steeper than a 3:1 slope.
 - ii. The cost estimate must show the calculation used to determine volume of soil needed for the final cover. The volume is not a simple area calculation multiplied by a 2 foot depth because the total surface areas for the side slopes and top will be greater than the footprint area.
 - e. A contingency factor of 10% or higher will not be questioned because that is considered reasonable. The basis for a contingency factor less than 10% must be explained.
3. Long Term Care Estimate:
 - a. The groundwater monitoring may assume that all the wells have been abandoned and or installed. (see my e-mail dated January 18, 2008 to Juan Guerra)
 - b. The cost estimate must assume the semi-annual ground water monitoring will be accomplished at wells MW-1, MW-5, MW-6, MW-7, MW-8, and MW-9 for at least five years after closure.
 - c. The cost estimate must assume there will be maintenance costs for the ground water monitoring wells during the five year period. The basis for the estimated costs must be stated.

- d. The landscape (mowing, fertilizer, etc) estimate is based on acreage. You must show the calculations used to determine the amount of surface area that will be maintained at the closed facility. (The footprint acreage does not take into account the slope surface area.) The basis for the estimate must be provided (such as, a cost quote from an outside contractor).
- e. The cost estimate must assume erosion control, cover maintenance, storm water management system maintenance, and security system maintenance will be necessary. The basis for the estimates must be provided.
- f. A contingency factor of 10% or higher will not be questioned because that is considered reasonable. The basis for a contingency factor less than 10% must be explained.