

**Meeting Notes CDIL Work Group**  
**October 9, 2008**  
**MPCA Conference Room 2-B**  
**9:00 am - 3:00 pm**

(edited by Jim Chiles and Nathan Cooley, bullets/numbers added)

**Rich Thul Behavioral Norms for Decision-making/Discussion**

- Attack/challenge ideas not individuals
- Patience
- Open-mindedness
- Facilitator manages speaking order
- Trust
- Speak one-at-a-time
- Faith
- Don't hold back
- Good will
- 2-minute speaking limit
- Honesty

Rich Thul Sheet 1 of 2

---

**Rich Thul Questionnaire**

1. Valuable? Y/N
  - a. What would make it more valuable?
2. Topics—right info?
  - a. Additional info?
3. Any additional info for Report?
4. Readiness to write Report? 1 thru 10
- 5.

Sheet 2

---

**[Jim Chiles poster notes]**

**Rich Thul Check in:**

1. looking for progress
2. interested in Trojan Report and assumptions
3. what GW problems at demo landfills if any
4. interested in data on GW at demo Landfills, moving forward
5. Glad Lisa Thorvig available as PCA liaison; unusual for WG to write report; normally stakeholder group reacts to report. More active PCA the better. PCA could help this process, more difficult if not involved

Jim Chiles Sheet 1 of 16

---

6. Agree with previous comment. Would like progress on Report outline today; need more input from PCA; educational period winding up.
7. We have dealt w/dumps before. GW soil-vapor and land use conflicts all relevant. —PCA involvement is crucial.
8. Make sure – Legislature often feels system is broken; actually there is more need for fine tuning; reality check.
9. Put Report together now; must start.
10. Want to know vetting process for issues.

Sheet 2

---

11. Feel time for report teams' formation—needed and important. Maybe PCA edits but not controls.
12. Flesh out topics in emails—focus of report and purpose.
13. Primarily interested in GW; okay to discuss other issues but not at expense of GW.
14. Curious on report consensus formation and how can bring in other agency information resources.

**Meeting Notes CDIL Work Group**  
**October 9, 2008**  
**MPCA Conference Room 2-B**  
**9:00 am - 3:00 pm**

(edited by Jim Chiles and Nathan Cooley, bullets/numbers added)

**Mike Trojan PPT presentations and questions.**

Sheet 3

- 
1. Did Mike Trojan study include any construction debris? (yes, some did). Re: class called “demo” landfill.
  2. Did you evaluate age of dumps/landfills? (yes, some regression analysis)
  3. Describe gradient decision; what if ambiguous/conflicting, e.g. switching water flows? (if uncertain, we threw out, but some uncertainty remained)
  4. 43 sites? (the number left after some discarded)
  5. Weren't your QA/QC GW monitoring problems fixed in the later guidance?

Sheet 4

- 
6. TIC's? (no, not in list, tentatively identified compounds)
  7. “Conservative” means what? (If had hits then looked at those, lower ones called nondetects. We didn't want to have doubts on conclusions.) [NOTE: Mike Trojan will follow up on what conservative means]
  8. Need more detail – is it “if impact detected we were pretty sure it is there?”
  9. Labs, did they change? (Typically didn't change at given demo landfill).
  10. What if elimination of data points doesn't happen? (not so much a compliance Q as a up gradient/down gradient analysis) This moves median lower.

Sheet 5

- 
11. Doesn't that move the IO's and IL's to 50 ppb—that effect? (Is a matter of ranking not eliminating points; 2.5 rank low, 5 rank high)
  12. Were there indicator chemicals always above the limits? (even if threw out other analyte data, we'd still show if sulfates higher downgradient than upgradient.)
  13. You didn't factor in HRLs for detection limit? (not for effects shown down gradient—that's other slide)
  14. Type of site demo, demo-industrial, demo-industrial-mixed municipal. Isn't that just the permitted demo class? (No. If technical staff felt site took industrial, we showed demo-industrial).

Sheet 6

- 
15. Would like clarification on how classed demo, demo-industrial, demo-industrial-municipal. We had demo LF that could not accept any construction debris, and another that could; more volatile organic compounds are in construction. Aren't the same—demo and construction.
  16. Lisa Thorvig. – data from 2003 is old, concerns on data quality mostly addressed in guidance document process—define GW direction, etc.
  17. How did this change the waste-acceptance criteria for demo landfills? (In guidance – will be covered).
  18. Size and age independent? (yes)

Sheet 7

- 
19. At our site, when we do a major construction job in our fill (new cell, etc.), Manganese and Boron go up temporarily; stir up dirt, get pulse in down gradient wells, in perched layer.
  20. Annual report and evaluation of GW data explanation is important, raw data not whole story.
  21. “Age not connected to inorganics.” What other site characteristics were evaluated? (waste type, size, age, geology, depth to bedrock)
  22. Does Mike Trojan Report go into sites? (yes)

**Meeting Notes CDIL Work Group**  
**October 9, 2008**  
**MPCA Conference Room 2-B**  
**9:00 am - 3:00 pm**

(edited by Jim Chiles and Nathan Cooley, bullets/numbers added)

**Lisa Thorvig PPT (PCA's overview)**

Sheet 8

- 
1. PBR—Why is 15,000 cubic yard and one-year outdated? (too large)
  2. Risk is what? (e.g Outside dumping, since site not well-controlled)
  3. Did they use the full 15,000 cu yd? (Not good information on final use except self reporting tied to SWM tax that is due per cubic yard)
  4. Is that 15,000 CY in place? (yes, is compacted)
  5. (Industrial) in my experience, PCA does use its regulatory authority.
  6. Have people challenged PCA authority over permitting? (no)

Sheet 9

- 
7. Does PCA expect CDIL to address LF siting for GW protections? (PCA will use CDIL report to inform rulemaking—is advice to us, we have to make final decision though, we are holding off rules until CDIL.)
  8. Does PCA expect CDIL to help change the guidance document too?
  9. My goal “I want to know how PCA technically approaches a site; if “inadequate” or “unsuitable”—how does PCA make that decision? (could set up a technical session for that, technical members with staff)
  10. Feel a look at specific site would help me understand.

Sheet 10

- 
11. (Gary Pulford—GW protection and financial assurance, there will be a rulemaking advisory committee so will have opportunity to join in that.)
  12. Suggest subgroup—location standards; that said, I'd like to hear why sites rejected or that could be given today's standards (e.g., how much karst disqualifies site—one outcrop, sinkhole 2 miles away? Does uncertainty factor in or do borings answer that?)
  13. Criteria for acceptability—I think mainly 3 (now): karst, monitorability, and what can be remediated—not just karst. (yes, Q came from Legis—is that adequate?)
  14. With West Lakeland (before) we rejected several sites—so case study might want to observe that.

Sheet 11

- 
15. My concern is that word not clear except for karst as a disqualifier, what is travel time acc/not acceptable to move contaminants off site. Can't address site design unless know all the decision criteria (technical panel makes collective decision)
  16. My point is that “what are the criteria they use at PCA?” Do they use 30, 100-year timeline (reported unpredictable flow in “karst” are called out—currently.)
  17. We look at risk a little differently. Landfills are better than when we started. We are reducing risks; if no landfill we get [illegal] burning of demo waste. Alternatives of lacking landfills is riskier. (Yes, is an evolution).

Sheet 12

- 
18. Is there a time frame on industrial landfill guidance? (Not yet) Would be good to involve stakeholders—is a diverse set of facilities.

**Meeting Notes CDIL Work Group**  
**October 9, 2008**  
**MPCA Conference Room 2-B**  
**9:00 am - 3:00 pm**

(edited by Jim Chiles and Nathan Cooley, bullets/numbers added)

**(Neal Wilson's presentation on CDIL list and protections and monitoring in place.)**

- Copy of parameter list— get to MDH (is on Web site too)
- Majority of demo landfills take less than 5,000 tons/year. For them, three GW monitoring wells is expensive—some will close. Maybe a size cutoff? (size not in the table in guidance, and looks like 6 demos are closing)
- But have some options like demo landfill transfer station; we heard some objection to lined MSW landfills too. Seems monitoring is the minimum they should do.

Sheet 13

---

**Rich Thul on consensus options - questions**

- Can we go through draft outline before lunch?
- Gave us several models of consensus—do we choose now?
- Similar to consensus model for demo guidance document—ideas all that we can agree on we go forward with.
- Legislative charge (statute) doesn't require consensus; we could say "industry X says this and Y says this." (Okay if Workgroup wants that consensus model. Question now is how to finish report)

Sheet 14

---

- What if one person doesn't go along with group; some groups say agreement means more than one "no" vote.
- If use demo landfill guidance as example, tended to middle ground, went to neither extreme. In case of highlighted conclusions, I'd put dissent in a footnote.
- Just pick a model and go forward with content.
- Could note minority opinion like a constitutional democracy; this isn't a life-threatening issue.
- Ok—minority opinions can be reflected in Report.
- With context, that's okay.

Sheet 15

---

- Question on recognition—who next to speak, order, etc.
- Time management on statements, keep to 2-3 minutes?

Outline talk

Next Meeting

Timeline with meeting-by-meeting goals

Recommendations drafted and brought forward ASAP

Sheet 16