



Burnsville Sanitary Landfill (BSL)

Responses to comments on the draft solid waste permit

I-1: J. Fischer

Submit Date: 07/21/2022 2:00 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-1-1

I feel out state should be more involved with the plastics problem. It should allow homeowners and those able to compost the option to do so in their own backyard. Instead of charging a compost fee do some serious plastics recycle program allowing more to be recycled instead of filling landfills

Response to I-1-1

The overall solid waste management strategy for the Twin City Metropolitan Area is described in the [Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan](#). The primary focus of the Plan is developing strategies to minimize our reliance on land disposal facilities. Public input to that process is vitally important so that the Agency can incorporate the concerns of residents in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The draft of the Plan will be released in 2023, and this will be one of the next opportunities for the public to participate in shaping solid waste policy. In addition, the Minnesota Legislature periodically brings up solid waste legislation, and the public can engage their legislators to inform them of their ideas and concerns regarding solid waste management.

I-2: Matt Car

Submit Date: 07/21/2022 6:45 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-2-1

I support the landfill expansion, the landfill is already lined, it is well taken care of, it does not leak into any water supply, and it provides habitat for bees and wildlife. Viewed from Bloomington it is a nice big green hill that blocks view of hwy 13 and commercial areas that stand out. and when it is complete and closed someday many trees will grow on it and be a nice area for wildlife, bees, birds. Waste management captures the methane it produces and uses it, it does not just flow into the area, if you go there you can see the methane wells, methane is used. the "greenest" and less carbon footprint for a landfill is one that is already there. a new landfill somewhere else would be less "green" and it would need to be built. Support the expansion, thank you

Response to I-2-1

Comment noted.

I-3: Anne Franklin

Submit Date: 07/21/2022 11:54 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-3-1

How does it even make sense to have a landfill near a river !?!?!

Response to I-3-1

State and Federal regulations for landfills were not developed, implemented, and enforced until the late 1980s. Prior to this time, old quarries, wetlands, and other low-lying areas were generally viewed as nuisance areas that would benefit from being filled. Therefore, before the regulations came into effect in the 1980s, landfills were often cited in these areas because landfills provided an opportunity to fill in these areas while serving a societal need for waste disposal.

Burnsville Sanitary Landfill (BSL) is one example of this. The landfill began operating in the late 1960s, which was prior to the promulgation of State and Federal regulations that restricted the location of landfills and how they were designed and operated. These old landfills were allowed to continue operation as long as they met new conditions in rule. Additional information on the rule changes and how BSL has altered its design, construction, and operations to meet the applicable rules are discussed in the cover page and operations history of the draft permit.

I-4: Deana Witt

Submit Date: 07/22/2022 7:18 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-4-1

We need to protect our water supply. This appears to be the best option. As a resident of Burnsville I'm frustrated by Bloomington residents complaining about the proposed height especially when their garbage is being sent to Burnsville.

Response to I-4-1

Comment noted.

I-5: Elaine Barr

Submit Date: 07/23/2022 8:10 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-5-1

I am concerned about the potential pollution to the air, ground, and river. I also can't imagine increasing the height by 92 feet! Will bulldozers be used at that height? The noise levels near 35W and the river are already very loud. I would not want to make it louder with this expansion.

Response to I-5-1

The technical review performed during the development of the permit evaluated the design and operation plans for the landfill. The proposed design and operations for the landfill expansion were found to meet applicable rules and standards for protection of the environment.

The air permit for the facility is currently being renewed and will be evaluated separately from the solid waste permit. Section 6.5 of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) contains findings regarding the potential air quality impacts from the landfill expansion (including from landfill gas), including potential mitigation measures. The BSL SEIS found that BSL's expansion is predicted to meet all applicable Minnesota Ambient Air Quality Standards (MAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The MPCA will continue to carefully consider BSL's potential air emissions and its potential impacts to residents during the air quality permitting process.

The noise levels are not regulated by this solid waste permit, but BSL is subject to the State of Minnesota's noise pollution control rule, [Minn. R. Chapter 7030](#). The [MPCA's Noise Pollution webpage](#) provides information on how noise pollution is regulated in Minnesota.

I-6: Catherine Sanders

Submit Date: 07/26/2022 2:32 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-6-1

Absolutely not!

Response to I-6-1

Comment noted.

I-7: Bryce Lunde

Submit Date: 07/27/2022 6:33 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-7-1

As a resident of Burnsville I speak for not only myself but for a lot of other concerned residents about this project. We moved in in 2005. We need that the landfill was not far away but at that time there wasn't a garbage mountain that was visible from anywhere near us. Now there is a visible mountain which yes is covered in grass and looks like a hill. However. When we sit and watch our daughters softball games and invite relatives and friends to watch. Everyone talks about how horrible it is to sit and stare at a giant garbage dump so close to the city. It doesn't make me proud to live in Burnsville and that makes me sad because we have always loved Burnsville but the landfill is defiantly what Burnsville is becoming known for. I also want to mention that we saw plans years ago to see the landfill turned into a golfcourse. The rock quarry filled with water. The whole area was supposed to be this beautiful park along the river and my wife and I where so excited. Because before that we were going to move since we felt like we were so close to the dump. But we stayed knowing that this was all going to change into an awesome area to live. But it didn't. Now we are stuck in this house due to finances and are super disappointed as many, many, many residents of Burnsville are. There isn't one resident in Burnsville who agrees with this project. This project will ruin house values in Burnsville and people like me who used to be proud of Burnsville will move. House values will go down and I'm already talking to a lawyer trying to find out what we and other people in our city can do to join together to stop this. I don't only come to you with this problem though either. I have a great idea for shutting this one down and an alternative landfill which I guarantee will be the solution to this problem. There is a landfill in Rosemount that isn't to far from the (I think it's called the flint hills or pine bend refinery) petroleum refinery. The whole area (all of the land) out by the refinery is perfect for a landfill. No one lives near there or wants to be anywhere near it. I think you should send out a survey. I promise there isn't one resident in Burnsville

that supports this project. We all want it gone. One more thing. I am a coach for the Burnsville High mountain bike team and an avid cyclist. Why would I bring this up?? Well. I have another idea that I've talked to a lot of people (parents) on our team, and other people in the cycling community about the idea of turning the landfill and rock quarry into a mountain biking Mecca. Something better than Cuyuna right here in the twin cities. If you look at Cuyuna and see the revenue that is coming into Crosby Minnesota and the people that are attracted to that area because of biking? It's crazy. Or look far south at Bentonville Arkansas. They have invested a lot of money into installing mountain bike courses everywhere. Now there are tons of people (good people) moving there just because of it. What I am trying to say is that cyclists are always good people. Especially mountain biking cyclists. This would be a great thing for our city. Something to be proud of. Not ashamed of like the landfill. I have many more ideas and would like to discuss this with someone over the phone. I hope this helps and really hope I'm one of the final nails in that coffin for the landfill project. Now let's literally bury it!!

Response to I-7-1

The ultimate development plans for the landfill are proposed by the Permittee and approved by the City of Burnsville through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) application and approval process. More information on that can be found here: <https://burnsvillemn.gov/2336/Landfill-Applications>

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules do have requirements for landfill closure and postclosure care. The intent of these rules is to ensure that the engineered final cover of the landfill is maintained so that it continues to function as designed after final closure of the landfill. As long as the Permittee is able to meet the requirements of these rules, there is some flexibility in the final end use of the landfill, and local governmental units often have more prescriptive rules for these final end uses. For BSL, the City of Burnsville provides this final approval through their PUD process. The MPCA encourages the commenter to contact the City of Burnsville to discuss your ideas for the final end use of the landfill and surrounding area.

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules do not have limitations on the final height of the landfill, though other jurisdictions such as the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) may have such restrictions. For this expansion project, the Permittee did provide the FAA with the project details for the final height of the landfill, and the FAA determined that the "structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation."

The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) did examine the effect of the landfill expansion on property values and found minimal evidence to support that the landfill expansion would negatively affect property values.

I-8: Douglas Kojetin

Submit Date: 07/27/2022 7:31 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-8-1

In reading the proposed draft, I would rather see the landfill not get further approval to continue at this site for the long-term future.

I have watched this landfill since I was a young adult. The whole area has changed so much with both housing and commercial areas.

It is time to start a new landfill further out of the metro area, away from rivers and lakes, and in a more rural area, away from developed areas.

Response to I-8-1

Landfills provide a necessary service to residents and businesses, and in most cases, there are environmental and economic benefits for landfills to be near the communities they support. The Twin Cities Metropolitan Area generates more than three million tons of waste per year, and the [Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan](#) sets goals for management of this waste. The state, counties, cities, businesses, nonprofits, communities, and citizens all have to embrace the waste reduction and recycling goals set forth by the Plan to achieve the recycling goals. Until then, the need for additional waste disposal capacity at facilities in the Twin Cities will persist.

I-9: kevin krueger

Submit Date: 07/28/2022 12:55 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-9-1

I support increasing the size and capacity of the Burnsville landfill with oversight and approved permitting from the MNPCA.

Response to I-9-1

Comment noted.

I-10: Andrea Chatfield

Submit Date: 07/30/2022 9:49 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-10-1

This is a bad idea for everyone. Negative effects will impact so many and will be hard to fix after it is realized this was a bad decision. Surrounding neighborhoods should not have to see and smell this mountain of trash. A second location needs to be found away from the river valley.

Response to I-10-1

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require that municipal solid waste landfills require regular environmental monitoring of groundwater, leachate, and landfill gas, and data gathered from this monitoring are reported to the MPCA and reviewed on an annual basis. The rules require a compliance boundary and utilize intervention limits for applicable standards that are meant to be proactive, meaning that potential environmental impacts can be identified and addressed before the standards are exceeded.

Please see response to comment I-9-1 regarding the need for new waste disposal facilities located farther away from the point of generation.

I-11: Nancy Anderson

Submit Date: 07/31/2022 10:02 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-11-1

The location of this landfill is the main issue. It is way to close to the river and has problems in the past where users were fined for utilizing it. Garbage should be incinerated not buried or stacked causing leaching to ground water. If the decision is to store solid waste then make it at least ten miles from rivers or lakes.

Response to I-11-1

Please see the response to comment I-3-1 for information on the location of the landfill. Current Federal and State regulations restrict where landfills can be located, and BSL will meet those requirements prior to expanding their footprint.

Regarding incineration of waste, the MPCA does rank waste-to-energy facilities above landfills in the waste management hierarchy. However, waste-to-energy facilities are also subject to economic and operational pressures, as evidenced by the recent closure of the Great River Energy waste-to-energy facility in Elk River. While the MPCA will continue to encourage waste-to-energy as a waste management strategy, the long-term viability of these facilities is influenced by the market for waste disposal. The waste-to-energy facilities serving the TCMA are currently operating at full capacity, so additional facilities would need to be brought online to handle additional waste.

I-12: Katie Toering

Submit Date: 08/05/2022 4:43 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-12-1

This is a vote to veto this project. I am a Veterinarian who grew up in Bloomington and watched the massive burnsville landfill rise high above original land height. As a scientist I cannot understand the thinking of having garbage with toxic chemicals and unidentified future toxic chemicals so close to a major river system. Monitoring is not proactive, that's reactive. Please think of the future 10, 20, 50 and 100 years from now and choose another method and site so we don't have regrets. Our waters are already impaired and this just adds to the possibility of more problems down the line. Thank you for your time, Katie Hennessy DVM

Response to I-12-1

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require that landfills install their monitoring networks within a compliance boundary, which must be located at least 200 feet from the property boundary. Further, the groundwater data is compared to intervention limits, which are one quarter of the applicable standards for each contaminant of concern. These regulatory measures are meant to be proactive to allow for corrective actions to be implemented prior to the identification of off-site groundwater impacts above regulatory standards. For this specific permit, the MPCA developed site specific water quality standards for this section of the Minnesota River.

In addition to the groundwater monitoring, special conditions were added to the permit that require the Permittee to develop a work plan to investigate the unlined portion of the landfill and provide a report to the MPCA with findings from the investigation. The work plan and report will both need to be reviewed and approved by the MPCA before new lined cells can be constructed over areas of the unlined portion of the landfill that have not been previously built over. The work plan and report must

consider both current and future conditions, including flooding of the Minnesota River and changes in groundwater elevations when the neighboring Kraemer Quarry stops pumping.

I-13: Ashley Asuncion

Submit Date: 08/06/2022 2:09 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-13-1

As a resident of Savage, MN I do NOT support this permit and the allowance of additional waste disposal. I believe this permit does not adequately address climate change and future water quality issues. The solid waste site should be closed and require the applicant to update and add liners to unlined pits. With the location near the Minnesota River, mitigation should be added to ensure leachate does not enter the ground water or surrounding water bodies.

Response to I-13-1

The MPCA has a major focus on climate change and continues to undertake initiatives for climate adaptation and resilience.. Climate change was considered when reviewing the design features of the proposed expansion, and in many cases the design was found to exceed the requirements of the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules and protects against larger rain and flooding events due to climate change. For example, the stormwater management features are designed to manage a 100-year, 24-hour storm, whereas the rules require that the landfill is designed to manage only a 25-year, 24-hour storm. The proposed expansion also includes the construction of a flood control berm on the north (river) side of the facility, and the top of the berm is at elevation 722 ft msl, which is only six inches below the 500-year flood stage of the Minnesota River (722.5 ft msl). For reference, the flood event in 1965, which is the highest flooding event in recorded history, peaked at 719.4 ft msl.

Regarding the future water quality issues, please see the response to comment I-12-1.

I-14: Thor Lien

Submit Date: 08/07/2022 2:43 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-14-1

I can say that I am not excited about the expansion of the landfill. Two things that really concern me are that it sits so close to the MN river and the other is the height that will be allowed for this new expansion. I know that there is discussion about putting a wall up for flooding purposes, but the reality is that we can never predict how high flooding can go. Also, don't we already have enough superfund sites in Dakota County with groundwater leakage from landfills. Does Burnsville really want to add another one in the future?

Response to I-14-1

Please see response to comment I-3-1 regarding the location near a river and response to comment I-17-1 for information on the flood control berm.

As was described in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS), groundwater monitoring has not identified impacts to groundwater for the monitored parameters. Please see the response to

comment I-12-1 for additional information on how the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require proactive groundwater monitoring systems for landfills.

I-15: Virginia Mceathron

Submit Date: 08/09/2022 9:32 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-15-1

It seems to me that putting more waste on top of old waste that hasn't been properly contained is just asking for trouble at some point in time. I rely on the water from my faucet for drinking water and everything else. I would feel that the people in charge of taking care of the purity of my water supply were negligent if the ground water became contaminated due to leakage from a supposedly deemed safe site. Sounds to me like the old site needs to be cleaned out, lined properly, then replaced before adding to an already existing problem.

Response to I-15-1

Please see response to comment I-12-1.

I-16: Stephanie Armstrong

Submit Date: 08/10/2022 12:17 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-16-1

I'm concerned about the fact that this is an unlined landfill. It doesn't appear with the possible expansion that any effort has been made to bring this landfill up to code. This seems like an irresponsible move to make this landfill - already a behemoth, and make it even larger, if you have no intentions of making sure we aren't protecting our water supply. Some sort of effort should be made to make sure we aren't leaking even more toxins, etc into the soil and water.

Response to I-16-1

Please see response to comment I-12-1.

I-17: Cathy Seurer

Submit Date: 08/11/2022 9:08 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-17-1

Hello,

I really cannot believe you are considering this permit to move forward! This is an extremely short-sided option that doesn't consider when the river floods (and it absolutely will), thereby contaminating that water source with who knows what is sitting in an unlined landfill from previous years. The potential for environmental disaster should far outweigh even considering the approval of this permit. I really cannot believe that the MPCA, whose job is to protect our natural resources, would even consider this as an option. Thank you.

Response to I-17-1

The proposed expansion includes the construction of a flood control berm on the north (river) side of the facility, and the top of the berm is at elevation 722 ft msl, which is only six inches below the 500-

year flood stage of the Minnesota River (722.5 ft msl). For reference, the flood event in 1965, which is the highest flooding event in recorded history, peaked at 719.4 ft msl.

In addition, the existing groundwater data from monitoring wells around BSL do not indicate that flooding events impact the groundwater quality. The MPCA has added special conditions to the permit (please see response to comment I-12-1) that require the Permittee to further evaluate the potential effects to groundwater quality from flooding and future changes in groundwater elevations.

I-18: Suzanne Moriarity

Submit Date: 08/24/2022 8:49 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-18-1

I am absolutely shocked that the MPCA is considering development of a landfill without fully lining it. Hasn't enough been learned from past experience about the dangers of proceeding with such an ill-considered approach? In fact, part of the existing landfill is currently unlined, which is disgraceful enough, and the thought of adding to the problem is completely irresponsible. There are so many problems here (e.g., potential for drastic river flooding due to climate change, ground water contamination, leachate, PFAS), that it seems the MPCA is not paying enough attention. Please put a hold on this entire project and consider a better plan that will protect the surrounding water sources and not require cleanup funding down the road.

Response to I-18-1

Please see the above responses for the following items:

- Unlined Portion of the Landfill – Response to comment I-12-1
- Flooding – Response to comment I-17-1
- Climate Change – Response to comment I-13-1
- Groundwater Monitoring – Responses to comments I-10-1 and I-12-1

As described in the permit, the Permittee will perform monitoring for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) as described in the MPCA PFAS Monitoring Plan (dated March 2022). Monitoring as described in the MPCA PFAS Monitoring Plan will be performed under a Sampling and Analysis Plan addendum, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or similar agreement, with any monitoring requirements and applicable standards outlined in that agreement. The City of Burnsville has added a condition to their Conditional Use Permit that requires Waste Management to participate in the MPCA's PFAS Monitoring Plan.

I-19: Melissa Bonekat

Submit Date: 08/29/2022 11:56 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment I-19-1

I am opposed to expanding the landfill-given the density of the population surrounding this location, proximity to water sources and overall landscape and topography of the area -this site should be decommissioned altogether. Instead a new site away from population and water sources should be assessed.

Response to I-19-1

Please see response to comment I-3-1 regarding the proximity of BSL to the Minnesota River and response to comment I-12-1 for additional information on how the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require proactive groundwater monitoring systems for landfills.

B-1: Burnsville Sanitary Landfill, Michael Miller

Submit Date: 09/06/2022 3:42 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment B-1-1

BSL requests that the following modified language be incorporated into permit condition 3.2.14 regarding insulating material over the liner: “The Permittee shall place at least six feet of solid waste, or an alternative insulating material approved by the MPCA prior to its use, on any newly constructed liner utilizing a compacted clay barrier layer by December 31 of each year. If an alternative insulating material is utilized, the Permittee shall install thermocouples in the newly lined area, and shall maintain the approved thickness of the insulating material until six feet of solid waste has been placed on the liner. If an alternative insulating material is utilized, the Permittee shall remove the material prior to the placement of solid waste to prevent biofouling of the drainage layer. No disposal may take place on uncovered areas after December 31 without testing the liner integrity and obtaining written approval from the Commissioner. [Minn. R. 7035.2815, subp. 13(U)]” Certain areas of the liner system utilize geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) instead of compacted clay for the barrier layer underlying the geomembrane liner. Due to the self-healing properties of a GCL after exposure to freeze-thaw conditions it is not necessary to insulate the liner areas that use a GCL barrier layer. BSL therefore requests that insulating material only be required on areas with a compacted clay barrier layer and not on areas with a GCL barrier layer. This design has been approved by MPCA at other solid waste landfills. The Facility’s Operations Plan will be updated to reflect this change and will be re-submitted to MPCA for inclusion in the final permit.

Response to B-1-1

The final permit will be updated with an additional condition that clarifies the requirement for a six-foot insulating layer over areas that do not utilize a clay barrier layer for the base liner.

Comment B-1-2

BSL requests that the following modified language be incorporated into permit condition 5.1.8 regarding submittal date for the autumn quarter leachate report:

“The Permittee shall submit autumn quarter leachate report: Due annually, by the 1st of ~~February~~ March. [Minn. R. 7035.2815, subp. 14(P)]”

The March 1 date corresponds with the autumn water monitoring report required under condition 5.1.4.

Response to B-1-2

This change will be made in the final permit to reflect the correct due date for annual reports.

Comment B-1-3

As part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval process, the City of Burnsville has requested

an updated phasing plan for the Facility. Preparation of the phasing plan is in progress. The updated phasing plan will be similar to that shown on Sheets 28 through 32 of the Permit Modification Drawings, with the following notable changes:

- The perimeter berm/levee for the ADA will be shown in the initial phase of development (i.e. Fill Increment 1). Construction of the levee will require a dry construction season, and planning for levee construction during the early stages of development will allow flexibility to construct when conditions are most suitable. This means construction could begin as early as 2023 if the dry conditions experienced during 2021 and 2022 continue, or if 2023 is a wetter year construction could be delayed to a drier year and/or phased over multiple years. The updated phasing plan will not supersede the requirements of applicable permits and approvals (e.g. MPCA permit, Burnsville PUD, etc.) pertaining to tasks that must be completed prior to expanding the facility footprint and/or constructing new slope liner over unlined areas of the landfill.
- Filling in the ADA will be shown in Fill Increment 3, instead of waiting until Fill Increment 4 as shown in the current phasing plan. This will allow BSL to better optimize the operational area and facilitate stormwater management during cell construction in the ADA.
- Filling in the ADA Phase A-1 and A-2 may be moved forward depending upon when the levee is completed and anticipated waste volume. The 2019 phasing drawing Phase 3 shows construction of the west ½ of the liner over the C&D area and Phase 4 was the construction and filling of the Annex Phase A-1 and A-2. WE are requesting the option to fill per the 2019 phasing plan or to move Phase 4 in front of Phase 3 and develop the first two phases of the annex first to build the base of the landfill before proceeding more vertical will be shown in Fill Increment 3, instead of waiting until Fill Increment 4 as shown in the current phasing plan. This will allow BSL to better optimize the operational area and facilitate stormwater management during cell construction in the ADA.

The Facility's Operations Plan and Permit Modification Drawings will be updated to reflect this change and will be re-submitted to the MPCA for inclusion in the final permit.

Response to B-1-3

The MPCA takes no issue with these revisions to the phasing plan for the landfill and will incorporate them by reference into the final permit.

Comment B-1-4

BSL requests several changes to the monitoring tables (i.e. sections 7, 8, 9) of the draft permit. The requested changes are shown on the attached copy of the permit tables.

Response to B-1-4

In most cases, the requested edits were incorporated into the final permit. However, those groundwater monitoring parameters that were requested to be removed based on the previous permit versions were left in the permit to match the current standard parameter list, as the MPCA believes that those parameters were left out in error in the previous permit revision.

G-1: City of Burnsville, Ryan Peterson

Submit Date: 08/18/2022 11:38 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment G-1-1

These comments are on behalf of the City of Burnsville and our concern for the groundwater in the area. This permit is quite complete and thorough. I had two major points I wanted to discuss/point out.

- 1) Regarding PFAS testing, the permit language on Page 6 would indicate that PFAS testing and monitoring will occur. After discussion with MPCA staff, it was stated that this testing would be voluntary for BSLI. The City was not satisfied with that and conditioned the zoning approval for the landfill expansion on BSLI participating in this. BSLI was acceptable to this and will participate in this important program.
- 2) Regarding Permit Requirement 3.1.146 - We agree and support this condition. The City would like to be part of the discussion regarding this. Can we be included?

Response to G-1-1

The MPCA is currently working with the permittee on the details for implementation of the PFAS Monitoring Plan. The MPCA appreciates the interest from the City of Burnsville regarding the special conditions and will engage the City, Dakota County, and other stakeholders as those special conditions are being addressed by the Permittee.

G-2: City of Bloomington, Glen Markegard

Submit Date: 09/02/2022 9:29 AM

Submit Method: Website

Comment G-2-1

Groundwater Impacts. Of great concern, the SEIS points out that parts of the BSL are unlined and that, during flooding events along the Minnesota River, the water table rises and interacts with the unlined portions of the landfill. The SEIS also predicts that the future discontinuance of dewatering at the adjacent Kraemer Quarry will significantly increase the elevation of the water table, resulting in regular interaction between waste in the unlined portions of the landfill and groundwater. The SEIS states the groundwater interacting with the waste “is predicted to discharge to the anticipated future quarry lake”. Once groundwater under the landfill is contaminated, it is likely to spread to surrounding areas and to the Minnesota River. That is exactly the reason the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is proposing a massive and expensive cleanup of the other two landfills in Burnsville along the Minnesota River that are now Superfund sites, the Freeway Landfill and Freeway Dump. The SEIS states: “having new waste on top of the unlined area may impede corrective action”.

Response to G-2-1

Groundwater monitoring conducted at BSL from 2014-2019 has not identified impacts to groundwater for the monitored parameters. As part of the solid waste permitting process, the MPCA updated the current standard parameters and monitoring limits based on Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) health risk limits or similar health standards, as appropriate, and evaluated additional contaminants of concern for potential inclusion into BSL’s permit. For example, 1,4-dioxane was added to the parameter list for the permit, and PFAS will be addressed through the MPCA’s PFAS Monitoring Plan.

Additional permitting requirements include identifying contingency actions to be taken if groundwater impacts are detected, as well as establishment of financial assurance that will provide funding for contingency actions and/or mitigation activities.

Predictive modeling indicates the potential for the water table to be in contact with the base of the unlined area at BSL if dewatering at the neighboring Kraemer Mining and Materials quarry ceases in the future. Without a better understanding of the future conditions of the quarry lake, we cannot anticipate the complete impacts of a discontinuation of dewatering. However, ongoing water level monitoring at BSL shows the water table periodically exceeds the base elevation of the unlined area during periods of flooding on the Minnesota River, and no significant changes in groundwater quality are evident for the monitored parameters following flood events.

In addition to the groundwater monitoring, special conditions were added to the permit that require the Permittee to develop a work plan to investigate the unlined portion of the landfill and provide a report to the MPCA with findings from the investigation. The work plan and report must consider both current and future conditions, including flooding of the Minnesota River and changes in groundwater elevations when the neighboring Kraemer Quarry stops pumping. This effort is designed to help answer questions or address potential issues flagged in the SEIS, as noted in your comments, related to the site's future conditions. The work plan and report will both need to be reviewed and approved by the MPCA before new lined cells can be constructed over areas of the unlined portion of the landfill that have not been previously built over.

Comment G-2-2

Visual Impacts. If the MPCA ultimately approves the full proposed volume of the BSL through this Permit and subsequent Permits, the design capacity of the landfill will be increased to 45 million cubic yards at buildout in 2062, a staggering volume that is difficult to visualize. To put that volume in context, the largest pyramid in Egypt has a volume of 3.37 million cubic yards. The expansion is proposed to increase the height of the landfill to an elevation of 1,082 feet above mean sea level, which is 372 feet above surrounding grade and 389 feet above the nearby Minnesota River. The top of the landfill is proposed to be higher than Mount Gilboa, Bloomington's highest elevation in the Hyland Ski and Snowboard Area. The top of the landfill is proposed to be more than 340 feet higher than the nearest residence in Burnsville, which is approximately 1,000 linear feet from the base of the landfill and 250 feet higher than the nearest residence in Bloomington, which is approximately 3,400 linear feet from the base of the landfill. The fact that the proposed landfill is required by the Federal Aviation Administration to have a red warning light on top to reduce the risks of airplane collisions illustrates the excessive height of proposed landfill. If the MPCA approves this expansion, the BSL will become the dominant and defining visual feature, indeed the representative symbol, of Burnsville and the surrounding area.

Response to G-2-2

Federal and State solid waste regulations do not pose any limitation on landfill height. The MPCA would encourage the commenter to contact their local legislators to discuss changes that could limit the height in the future.

Comment G-2-3

Surface Water Impacts. The Final SEIS notes that, in a 500-year storm, the proposed expansion will increase the peak storm water runoff discharge rate from the site by 47% due to the increase in landfill slope proposed with the expansion. Climate change is resulting in more frequent large storm events. A significant increase in peak runoff rates will cause substantial negative impact to people and property downstream during these major rainfall events, which is the time at which faster runoff rates are most damaging.

Response to G-2-3

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require that landfills are designed to manage a 25-year, 24-hour storm event, and the expansion for BSL was designed to manage a 100-year, 24-hour storm.

Comment G-2-4

Air Quality. The SEIS estimates that, at buildout, the landfill will generate 5,863 standard cubic feet of landfill gases every minute. Of that volume, 75 percent is planned to be captured and 25 percent will escape into the atmosphere. Roughly half of the captured gases will be flared on site. As a direct result of the expansion, the SEIS reports that volatile organic compounds will increase by 10.2 tons/year and hazardous air pollutants will increase by 5.4 tons/year.

Response to G-2-4

The air quality permit for the facility is currently being renewed and will be evaluated separately from the solid waste permit. Section 6.5 of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) contains findings regarding the potential air quality impacts from the landfill expansion (including from landfill gas) and potential mitigation measures. The BSL SEIS found that BSL's expansion is predicted to meet all applicable Minnesota Ambient Air Quality Standards (MAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The MPCA will continue to carefully consider BSL's potential air emissions and its potential impacts to residents during the air quality permitting process. Comments can be submitted on the draft air permit during the public comment period.

Comment G-2-5

Environmental Justice. The SEIS states that the project is located within an area of concern for environmental justice. The State of Minnesota flags this area for concern based on U.S. Census Bureau income data for the Burnsville neighborhood hosting the landfill.

Response to G-2-5

The BSL Project area is an area of concern for environmental justice because it is located within a U.S. Census tract where at least 40% of people report a household income less than 185% of the federal poverty level. The BSL DSEIS sourced this information from the [MPCA and environmental justice webpage](#). The webpage includes a link to a [map of Areas of Environmental Concern](#). The MPCA used this map and BSL's address to determine that BSL is located in an EJ area of concern.

Because the Project is located within an area of concern for environmental justice, the environmental impacts associated with the Project that were outlined in the Final Scoping Decision Document for the BSL SEIS were assessed within the context of whether said impacts would result in disproportionate exposure to pollution within the identified area of environmental justice concern. The assessment indicated that no such disproportionate exposures would be expected to result from the landfill expansion.

Comment G-2-6

Odor. The landfill is located within 1,000 feet of residences in Burnsville and 3,400 feet of residences in Bloomington. Depending on wind direction, odor impacts from both the trash deposits and from methane and other volatile organic compounds is anticipated. The SEIS estimates that, at buildout, 1,465 standard cubic feet of landfill gases per minute will not be captured or flared and instead will escape into the atmosphere.

Response to G-2-6

The SEIS found that the expansion is not expected to cause increased odors relative to current conditions, and current regulations do not have limits for odors that can be measured and enforced. The Solid Waste Permit does include permit conditions that seek to reduce the odors produced during operations, including requirements that waste material is covered with suitable cover materials at the end of each day. The Permit also includes conditions that require the active waste disposal area is as small as practical and brought to final elevation as quickly as possible so final cover materials can be installed.

Comment G-2-7

Noise. The landfill expansion will generate noise impacts for surrounding residential uses as machinery shuttles the waste from 57 fully loaded garbage trucks per day up the steep inclines to the top of the landfill. Large earth movers will create more noise as fill is added on top of the waste.

Response to G-2-7

BSL is subject to the state of Minnesota's noise pollution control rule, [Minn. R. Chapter 7030](#). The [MPCA's Noise Pollution webpage](#) provides information on how noise pollution is regulated in Minnesota. Limitations on noise are covered through these rules, which are not part of the Solid Waste Permit. The expansion of BSL will result in no operational changes and therefore no increase in truck traffic.

Comment G-2-8

Aviation Impacts. Landfills are notorious for attracting large birds. During a visit to the perimeter of the BSL, Bloomington staff observed numerous eagles, gulls and other large birds. The birds attracted to landfills and corresponding concerns regarding mid-air collisions with birds are the primary reason the FAA has serious concerns about placing landfills near airports. The Burnsville Sanitary Landfill expansion is proposed near MSP International and Flying Cloud Airports and directly underneath a very frequently used flyway departing MSP, one of the nation's busiest airports. The increased height of the landfill and corresponding orographic lift will bring birds closer to aircraft and may present special concerns. Attachment G of the SEIS includes a letter from the FAA to the City of Burnsville. In that letter, an FAA representative states: "Based on our review and utilizing the criteria in AC's 150/5200-33B, the FAA is concerned with the initial proposed project given the location, and potential to create a wildlife hazard attractant near the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP)."

Response to G-2-8

The letter from the FAA referenced in the comment was dated March 4, 2019. The FAA issued a letter to the permittee on November 2, 2021, that determined the "structure does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation" provided that the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA requirements "within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height."

Comment G-2-9

Waste Composition. The Final SEIS notes that, as of December 2019, 69 percent of the waste being landfilled at BSL is recoverable (such as organics and recyclables). The impacts of the proposed expansion can be partially limited by reducing the volume of waste permitted. Bloomington acknowledges the MPCA response to Bloomington's July 2021 comments on the Draft SEIS that "the MPCA will include all applicable recycling requirements in BSL's next solid waste disposal permit". Given the inherent environmental risks of adding waste in a floodplain along the Minnesota River, given environmental justice concerns of placing waste in an area of concern for environmental justice and given the significant visual impacts, simply meeting the same standard for recycling that applies to other Minnesota landfills is not sufficient. The Permit should require, as mitigation, that a higher level of organics and recyclables be removed at BSL than is required at other landfills that do not have similar environmental risks, similar environmental justice concerns and similar visual impacts. Adequately addressing these issues requires an aggressive limitation on landfilling organics and recyclables at BSL coupled with a corresponding reduction in the size of the landfill potentially permitted. Required mitigation should include the installation of equipment on-site to remove recyclables and organics from waste and to shred the remaining waste for more compact disposal prior to placement of the waste in the landfill.

Response to G-2-9

As a point of clarification, the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules preclude landfill expansion into a floodplain, which is reinforced in the draft permit conditions. Prior to any horizontal expansion, the Permittee will need to obtain further permits or approvals from the United States Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to formalize the removal of the landfill expansion area from the floodplain and to address wetland impacts and mitigation. This process is further described in the cover page of the draft permit.

Please refer to response to comment G-2-5 regarding the environmental justice concerns.

Removal of organics from waste is considerably more effective if performed at the source (e.g., residences, businesses) before the commingled waste arrives at the landfill. The overall solid waste management strategy for the Twin City Metropolitan Area is described in the [Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan](#). The primary focus of the Plan is developing strategies to minimize our reliance on land disposal facilities. Public input to that process is vitally important so that the Agency can incorporate the concerns of residents in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The draft of the Plan will be released in 2023, and this will be one of the next opportunities for the public to participate in shaping solid waste policy, such as reducing organics and other materials from being landfilled. To help support these goals, this permit removes recycling limits from the waste capacity table to allow the Permittee to recycle as much material as possible. The permit also includes Restriction on Disposal requirements, which are meant to ensure that waste-to-energy facilities are receiving adequate waste volumes to operate at full capacity and thus minimize the land disposal of these waste materials.

In addition, the Minnesota Legislature periodically brings up solid waste legislation, and the public can engage their legislators to inform them of their ideas and desires to see more waste prevention, reuse, organics collection, and recycling to prevent the need for more landfill space. In 2021, the MPCA proposed nearly \$19 million to support various efforts (e.g. food waste prevention, composting) to reduce waste disposal.

Comment G-2-10

Groundwater Impacts. Given the high level of concern regarding the interaction of the water table with unlined portions of the landfill and the corresponding potential discharge of contaminants to surrounding water bodies and given that the Final SEIS states: “having new waste on top of the unlined area may impede corrective action”, Bloomington requests that the following mitigation measures be required by the Permit. Minnesota needs to learn from the expensive and potentially environmentally damaging lessons experienced at the Freeway Landfill and the Freeway Dump and not allow future corrective action to be impeded by placing additional waste over the unlined portions of the BSL.

a. Require waste in the unlined portions of the landfill to be relocated to portions of the site that are sufficiently lined. The MPCA is proposing this approach at Freeway Landfill and Freeway Dump using public funds. In this case, the remediation should be done using private funds by attaching conditions to the Permit for further expansion.

b. Require regular groundwater monitoring by the MPCA and, in the event of detection of any groundwater contamination, require both that remediation be paid for by the landfill owner and that further expansion be prohibited.

Response to G-2-10

The MPCA acknowledges the concerns regarding Freeway Landfill and Freeway Dump (Freeway), but these sites have differences from BSL. BSL has operated under the rules and regulations governing the facility since it began operating and has adjusted its design and operations to meet new rules (for example, those solid waste rules promulgated in the 1980s). This includes installation of landfill liners, engineered covers, a landfill gas extraction system, and an adequate groundwater monitoring system at BSL, which were not implemented at Freeway. These operational differences have resulted in different environmental conditions at BSL than at Freeway. Please refer to the cover page and facility history in the draft permit for additional information.

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules also require that municipal solid waste facilities provide a mechanism for financial assurance to cover contingency actions, closure, and postclosure care. The estimated cost for the contingency action related to groundwater remediation is being added to the Permittee's current financial assurance amount. As detailed in the response to comment G-2-1, the MPCA has included special conditions in the permit that will require additional information to be submitted by the Permittee and approved by the MPCA prior to additional waste placement over new unlined area.

The draft permit does include the components of the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules that require groundwater monitoring by the Permittee, and the Rules also include a defined process for the evaluation of corrective actions if impacts to the groundwater are identified through the groundwater monitoring. Costs for the monitoring and corrective actions are the responsibility of the Permittee. Further, the Minnesota Solid Waste Rules require that a Contingency Action Plan be maintained by the Permittee, and the MPCA required that the permittee add a contingency action for groundwater remediation. Therefore, in the event that groundwater impacts are identified, the Permittee will be required to verify the groundwater contamination and implement the contingency action to address the contamination, and the Permittee will be allowed to utilize funds from their financial assurance mechanism to do so. Once a contingency action is implemented, the Permittee will be required to update their Contingency Action Plan and corresponding financial assurance amount to account for the next potential outcome of the groundwater contamination. For example, if the current contingency action plan includes a pump-and-treat groundwater remediation system that discharges to the sanitary sewer, then the next contingency action could be the installation of a dedicated treatment system to treat the groundwater in case the wastewater treatment facility can no longer accept the contaminated groundwater.

Comment G-2-11

Surface Water Impacts. The Final SEIS notes that, in a 500-year storm, the proposed expansion will increase the peak storm water runoff discharge rate from the site by 47% due to the increase in landfill slope proposed with the expansion. Climate change is resulting in more frequent large storm events. A significant increase in peak runoff rates will cause substantial negative impact to people and property downstream during these major rainfall events, which is the time at which faster runoff rates are most damaging. Bloomington requests that conditions be attached to the Permit that require design changes that restrict water runoff discharge rates from the site during a 500-year storm to current discharge rates during a similar event.

Response to G-2-11

Please see response to comment G-2-3. The Contingency Action Plan for BSL includes measures and financial assurance for erosion and other potential issues caused by a severe weather event.

BSL is also covered under an Industrial Stormwater Permit, which has requirements for operation and maintenance of the facility and for erosion and sedimentation control measures.

Comment G-2-12

Visual Impacts. Bloomington notes the following statement in the Final SEIS: “The visual impacts of the Project could be mitigated by...reducing the height of the proposed landfill expansion”. Bloomington strongly requests that the MPCA follows through on this mitigation technique suggested by the Final SEIS and apply permanent height limits to the Permit to reduce visual impact. Rather than the temporary volume or height limit suggested by the Draft Permit, which is likely to be increased through future applications, Bloomington requests a permanent height/volume limit.

Response to G-2-12

Please see response to comment G-2-2 regarding the landfill height. The activities identified in the Metro Policy Plan and other initiatives could result in reduced waste disposal demand, which could extend the operating life of the landfill or reduce the need for its full capacity.

The MPCA utilizes a 10-year period for its Solid Waste Permits to allow for reevaluation of solid waste facilities at regular intervals. The volume limits are established in each permit and informed by the Certificate of Need (CON) issued to the facility, which was recently issued for an estimated seven-year period. The MPCA will continue to evaluate the need for additional landfill capacity through future CON determinations, and the disposal capacity in future permits will depend on these CON determinations. Note that the CON process considers waste contributions from all seven counties in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Comment G-2-13

Environmental Justice. The Final SEIS states that the project is located within an area of concern for environmental justice. It is important to note that multiple nearby competing landfills are not located in areas of concern for environmental justice. Environmental justice impacts can be avoided by not permitting further expansion of BSL. Similarly, environmental justice impacts can be reduced by reducing the amount of waste entering BSL. Bloomington requests that the MPCA avoid the environmental justice concerns identified in the SEIS by either not permitting further expansion or substantially limiting further expansion of BSL.

Response to G-2-13

Please see response to comment G-2-5.

Comment G-2-14

Air Quality. The Final SEIS states that “the MPCA will continue to carefully consider BSL’s potential air emissions and its potential impacts to residents during the air quality permitting process for the Project”. Much of the gas created will be a result of the anaerobic degradation of organics. As a way to reduce gas creation, air pollutants and damaging greenhouse gases, Bloomington requests a condition of approval be attached to the Permit that requires organic material to be removed from the waste stream onsite prior to the waste being landfilled. Bloomington also requests that the MPCA be particularly sensitive to the proximity of nearby residential uses in its review of associated air quality impacts and how to appropriately dispose of the captured gases.

Response to G-2-14

Removal of organics from waste is considerably more effective if performed at the source (e.g., residences, businesses) before the commingled waste arrives at the landfill. Goals for organics removal and recycling are set by the [Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan](#), and we encourage stakeholders to review and comment on that Plan when it is released in draft form later this year.

The air quality permit for the facility is currently being renewed and will be evaluated separately from the solid waste permit. Section 6.5 of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) contains findings regarding the potential air quality impacts from the landfill expansion (including from landfill gas), including potential mitigation measures. The BSL SEIS found that BSL’s expansion is predicted to meet all applicable Minnesota Ambient Air Quality Standards (MAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The MPCA will continue to carefully consider BSL’s potential air emissions and its potential impacts to residents during the air quality permitting process.

Comment G-2-15

Aviation Impacts. To reduce the threats to aviation from bird strikes, Bloomington requests that the Permit include mitigation measures to reduce the attraction of birds to the landfill. Given that birds are attracted by organic materials, these measures should include the removal of organic material from the waste stream onsite prior to the waste being landfilled.

Response to G-2-15

The Minnesota Solid Waste Rules include operational requirements for the landfill, including the use of intermittent (daily) cover to, among other things, reduce vector and animal intrusion. Requirements from the Rules have been incorporated into the solid waste permit. Please see response to comment G-2-14 regarding the removal of organic material at the landfill.

Comment G-2-16

Size Reductions. The Final SEIS states: “If a 75% recycling and preprocessing rate is achieved by year 2030, the size of the expansion could be reduced from 23.6 million cubic yards to 11.9 million cubic yards resulting in a reduction in height of the expansion to elevation 862 feet using the same expansion footprint.” It also states: “Shredding of waste prior to disposal in the landfill could reduce the waste volume by up to 75% according to manufacturers of shredding equipment”. Bloomington requests that the Permit include conditions requiring:

- a. a 75 percent recycling and preprocessing rate by the year 2030;
- b. removal of recyclables and organics and the shredding of remaining waste on-site prior to disposal; and
- c. a corresponding reduction in the volume of waste allowed under the permit. In past public documents, the MPCA stated that “volume reduction strategies will be discussed with the permittee during the permitting process, including shredding”.

Bloomington requests that the MPCA go beyond discussing volume reduction strategies with the applicant and formally requires such strategies as a Permit condition.

Response to G-2-16

The whole seven county metro area is subject to the 75% goal laid out in statute, and the SEIS did not find that the expansion of BSL would have an adverse impact on this recycling goal. . Waste reduction strategies and the 75% recycling goal for the seven-county metropolitan area will be evaluated in the forthcoming [Metro Solid Waste Policy Plan](#), and we encourage stakeholders to review and comment on that Plan when it is released in draft form in 2023. Please see response to comment G-2-9 for additional information. While shredding may achieve volume reductions, the SEIS further states limitations and operational challenges for implementation of shredding at BSL. The amount of waste received by BSL would require a large, multi-stage shredding operation, and current site constraints at BSL do not provide space for such an operation. Volume reduction strategies were discussed during the permitting process, but ultimately it was determined that volume reduction is most effectively achieved by reducing the amount of waste that is received by the landfill. The MPCA regularly reviews data submitted by landfill facilities and will continue to work with BSL to identify opportunities for volume reduction. The MPCA has proposed legislation like the Landfill Responsibility Act to require landfills to reduce waste disposal, but this legislation was not enacted by the Legislature.

Comment G-2-17

Public Input. Given the significant environmental, visual and other impacts of the proposed expansion, significant public outreach to nearby residents in the cities of Burnsville, Savage, and Bloomington is vital to ensure public understanding and input opportunities. Outreach and input that engages residents where they live and socialize is particularly important given that the expansion is proposed in an area flagged by the state for environmental justice concerns. Bloomington appreciates the one opportunity for questions that the MPCA offered on August 10th in Burnsville, but requests that the MPCA conducts a series of well publicized outreach events in the impacted neighborhoods of Burnsville, Savage, and Bloomington prior to taking any action on the Permit application.

Response to G-2-17

The public comment period on the Draft Permit has concluded, and therefore the MPCA will not be accepting any more public comments on that document.

The MPCA's public outreach regarding the BSL Draft Permit included the following measures:

- Attendance at the City of Burnsville's City Council and Planning Commission meetings meeting to answer any questions during agenda items related to BSL
- Attendance at the City of Bloomington's City Council meeting on 8/29/2022
- Presentations to the Rotary Club of Burnsville and the Rotary Club of Bloomington
- Social media outreach utilizing recurring posts on Facebook and Nextdoor to target neighborhoods around the landfill, as well as residents of Burnsville, Bloomington and Savage. This content informed residents of the draft permit and encouraged them to attend the in-person public meeting and submit comments using the agency's online platform.
- Publication of the Draft Permit on the MPCA's webpage for the BSL Project
- Notifying subscribed members of the GovDelivery mailing list for Public Notices for Solid Waste
- Notifying media outlets of availability of the Draft Permit
 - Savage Pacer
 - Shakopee Valley News
 - Star Tribune
 - Pioneer Press
 - Mpls/St. Paul Business Journal
 - Finance and Commerce
 - Minnpost
 - Sun Thisweek (Apple Valley, Lakeville, Burnsville, Eagan, Rosemount, Farmington)
 - MPR
- Individual phone calls to elected members of the Minnesota House of Representatives, Minnesota Senate, Hennepin County, City of Burnsville, City of Bloomington, and City of Savage
- Mailings (either email or U.S. Mail) to adjacent landowners, adjacent counties, and adjacent townships and municipalities
-

G-3: Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, Debbie Goettel

Submit Date: 09/06/2022 1:46 PM

Submit Method: Website

Comment G-3-1

Groundwater Impacts. Of great concern, the SEIS points out that parts of the BSL are unlined and that, during flooding events along the Minnesota River, the water table rises and interacts with the unlined portions of the landfill. The SEIS also predicts that the future discontinuance of dewatering at the adjacent Kraemer Quarry will significantly increase the elevation of the water table, resulting in regular interaction between waste in the unlined portions of the landfill and groundwater.

Response to G-3-1

Please see response to comment G-2-1.

Comment G-3-2

Visual Impacts. If the MPCA ultimately approves the full proposed volume of the BSL through this Permit and subsequent Permits, the design capacity of the landfill will be increased to 45 million cubic yards at buildout in 2062, a staggering volume that is difficult to visualize. To put that volume in context, the largest pyramid in Egypt has a volume of 3.37 million cubic yards. The expansion is proposed to increase the height of the landfill to an elevation of 1,082 feet above mean sea level, which is 372 feet above surrounding grade and 389 feet above the nearby Minnesota River. If the MPCA approves this expansion, the BSL will become the dominant and defining visual feature, indeed the representative symbol, of Burnsville and the surrounding area.

Response to G-3-2

Please see response to comment G-2-2.

Comment G-3-3

Surface Water Impacts. The Final SEIS notes that, in a 500-year storm, the proposed expansion will increase the peak storm water runoff discharge rate from the site by 47% due to the increase in landfill slope proposed with the expansion. Climate change is resulting in more frequent large storm events. A significant increase in peak runoff rates will cause substantial negative impact to people and property downstream during these major rainfall events, which is the time at which faster runoff rates are most damaging.

Response to G-3-3

Please see response to comment G-2-3.

Comment G-3-4

Air Quality. The SEIS estimates that, at buildout, the landfill will generate 5,863 standard cubic feet of landfill gases every minute. Of that volume, 75 percent is planned to be captured and 25 percent will escape into the atmosphere. Roughly half of the captured gases will be flared on site. As a direct result of the expansion, the SEIS reports that volatile organic compounds will increase by 10.2 tons/year and hazardous air pollutants will increase by 5.4 tons/year.

Response to G-3-4

Please see response to comment G-2-4.

Comment G-3-5

Environmental Justice. The SEIS states that the project is located within an area of concern for environmental justice. The State of Minnesota flags this area for concern based on U.S. Census Bureau income data for the Burnsville neighborhood hosting the landfill.

Response to G-3-5

Please see response to comment G-2-5.

Comment G-3-6

Odor. The landfill is located within 1,000 feet of residences in Burnsville and 3,400 feet of residences in Bloomington. Depending on wind direction, odor impacts from both the trash deposits and from methane and other volatile organic compounds is anticipated. The SEIS estimates that, at buildout, 1,465 standard cubic feet of landfill gases per minute will not be captured or flared and instead will escape into the atmosphere.

Response to G-3-6

Please see response to comment G-2-6.

Comment G-3-7

Noise. The landfill expansion will generate noise impacts for surrounding residential uses as machinery shuttles the waste from 57 fully loaded garbage trucks per day up the steep inclines to the top of the landfill. Large earth movers will create more noise as fill is added on top of the waste.

Response to G-3-7

Please see response to comment G-2-7.

Comment G-3-8

Aviation Impacts. Landfills are notorious for attracting large birds. During a visit to the perimeter of the BSL, Bloomington staff observed numerous eagles, gulls, and other large birds. The birds attracted to landfills and corresponding concerns regarding mid-air collisions with birds are the primary reason the FAA has serious concerns about placing landfills near airports. The Burnsville Sanitary Landfill expansion is proposed near MSP International and Flying Cloud Airports.

Response to G-3-8

Please see response to comment G-2-8.