



**Gude Landfill Remediation Design
Basis of Design
Montgomery County, Maryland
90% Submission**

Prepared for

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority and
Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection
Recycling and Resource Management Division
Montgomery County, Maryland

Prepared by

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
(410) 584-7000

July 2020
EA Project No. 15646.01

This page intentionally left blank

**Gude Landfill Remediation Design
Basis of Design
Montgomery County, Maryland**

90% Submission

Prepared for

Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority and
Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection
Recycling and Resource Management Division
Montgomery County, Maryland

Prepared by

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
(410) 584-7000

July 2020
EA Project No. 15646.01

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES	1
1.2 BACKGROUND	2
1.2.1 Site Location and Overview.....	2
1.2.2 Site and Surrounding Area Land Use	2
1.2.3 Site History	3
1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION.....	3
1.3.1 Topography	3
1.3.2 Geology.....	3
1.3.3 Hydrogeologic Setting	4
1.3.4 Groundwater Flow	4
1.4 DESIGN CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS	4
2. PRE-DESIGN INVESTIGATION	7
2.1 SITE SPECIFIC HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN.....	7
2.2 SURVEY.....	7
2.3 UTILITY LOCATION	7
2.4 GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION.....	7
2.5 NATIONAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORREST STAND DELINEATION/ FOREST CONSERVATION PLAN	8
2.6 TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY.....	8
2.7 LANDFILL GAS INVESTIGATION	8
3. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS	11
4. DESIGN ELEMENTS	13
4.1 STAGING AND STOCKPILE AREAS.....	13
4.2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE.....	13
4.2.1 Global Slope Stability	15
4.3 CONSTRUCTION PHASING	15
4.4 WASTE EXCAVATION AND HANDLING.....	15
4.5 CLOSURE CAP.....	16
4.5.1 Geosynthetic Closure Cap.....	16

4.5.1.1	Subgrade	16
4.5.1.2	Geotextile.....	16
4.5.1.3	Geomembrane.....	16
4.5.1.4	Geocomposite Drainage Layer	17
4.5.1.5	Vegetative Support Soil.....	17
4.5.1.6	Alternate Geosynthetic Closure Cap Section	17
4.5.1.7	Geosynthetic Closure Cap Stability.....	18
4.5.2	Earth Closure Cap	18
4.5.3	Vegetative Stabilization	18
4.6	ACCESS ROADS.....	18
4.7	LANDFILL GAS MANAGEMENT	18
4.7.1	Existing System Description.....	18
4.7.2	Anticipated LFG Production.....	19
4.7.3	System Design Details	20
4.7.4	Landfill Gas Extraction Well Network	20
4.7.5	Landfill Gas Collection System Piping.....	21
4.7.6	Landfill Gas Condensate Collection	22
4.7.7	Blower-Flare Facility	24
4.8	DEWATERING SUMPS.....	25
4.9	GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELLS	25
4.10	PIEZOMETERS	26
4.11	LANDFILL GAS MONITORING WELLS.....	26
4.12	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT	26
4.13	EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL	26
4.14	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT.....	27
4.15	SETTLEMENT.....	27
4.16	FUTURE LAND USE EVALUATION	28
5.	POST-CLOSURE CARE PLAN	29
6.	REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/ REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FORMAT.....	31
6.1	CONTRACTOR PROCUREMENT.....	31
6.2	PRICE PROPOSAL ITEMS.....	31
7.	ANTICIPATED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	33
8.	REFERENCES	35

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- ATTACHMENT A: TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
- ATTACHMENT B: UTILITY LOCATING REPORT
- ATTACHMENT C: GEOTECHNICAL EVALUATION
- ATTACHMENT D: FOREST STAND DELINEATION REPORT AND WETLAND
DELINEATION REPORT
- ATTACHMENT E: TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY
- ATTACHMENT F: LANDFILL GAS TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
- ATTACHMENT G: PERMIT COMPLIANCE REPORT
- ATTACHMENT H: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT
- ATTACHMENT I: GEOSYNTHETICS CALCULATIONS
- ATTACHMENT J: CONDENSATE QUANTITY AND QUALITY EVALUATION
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
- ATTACHMENT K: LANDFILL GAS CALCULATIONS
- ATTACHMENT L: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
- ATTACHMENT M: POST-CLOSURE CARE PLAN
- ATTACHMENT N: CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE
- ATTACHMENT O: PASSIVE RECREATION LAND USE BASIS OF DESIGN

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Existing Grades Analysis
2	Proposed Grades Analysis
3	Projected LFG Production from LandGEM Model
4	Landfill Gas Radius of Influence
5	Projected LFG Production Comparison
6	Potential Dry Locations in Landfill Gas Collection System

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Slope Areas
2	Condensate Drain Summary

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACM the Authority	Assessment of Corrective Measures Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority
cfm	Cubic feet per minute
CMA	Corrective Measure Alternative
COMAR	Code of Maryland Regulations
the County	Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, Recycling and Resource Management Division
DPS	Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services
EA	EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Floura Teeter ft	Floura Teeter Landscape Architects Foot (feet)
in.	Inch(es)
the Landfill	Gude Landfill
LFG	Landfill gas
LFGE	Landfill gas-to-energy
MDE	Maryland Department of the Environment
M-NCPPC	Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
RAOs	Remedial Action Objectives
scfm	Standard cubic feet per minute
TIS	Traffic Impact Study

This page intentionally left blank

1. INTRODUCTION

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC (EA) has been contracted to provide engineering, permitting, and support services for addressing the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) at the Gude Landfill (the Landfill) in order to achieve compliance with the consent order for the Landfill (MDE Case Number CO-11-SW-036) (Maryland Department of the Environment [MDE] and Montgomery County 2013). This design report serves as the basis of design and documents the project objectives, assumptions, requirements, technical determinations, and overall decisions made or to be made in the development of the final design.

1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The consent order for the Landfill establishes the following RAOs:

- No exceedances of maximum contaminant levels, established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as limits for drinking water, in the groundwater at the Landfill property boundary or between the Landfill and adjacent streams;
- No lower explosive limit exceedances for methane gas at the Landfill property boundary; and
- No non-stormwater discharges to the waters of the State.

EA developed an Assessment of Corrective Measures (ACM) Report (EA 2016) to identify a recommended Corrective Measure Alternative (CMA) for the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, Recycling and Resource Management Division (the County) to meet regulatory compliance requirements at the Landfill. Based on the results of the evaluation presented in the ACM Report, MDE approved the recommended CMA, toupee capping and additional landfill gas (LFG) collection. This CMA includes the following components:

- Construction of a toupee closure cap over the top of the Landfill (inclusive of the Northwest, West, Southwest, South, and Southeast Areas), as well as the Landfill side-slopes in the Northwest and West Areas; and
- Construction/installation of additional LFG Collection in the Northwest, West, and Southwest Areas.

Landfill capping was selected as a corrective measure for the Landfill upper surface, as well as portions of the side-slopes of the Landfill, to address maximum contaminant level exceedances in groundwater, as well as leachate seeps and LFG lower explosive limit exceedances in the Northwest and West Areas. The LFG collection system will be reconstructed in phases to ensure continuous LFG collection across the site. Existing monitoring points for the landfill, such as groundwater monitoring wells and LFG perimeter probes, along the limits of disturbance will be protected and maintained. The LFG collection system will include modifications to existing extraction wells and the installation of new extraction wells to provide additional control over gas

migration along the property boundary to prevent lower explosive limit exceedances for methane gas.

1.2 BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Site Location and Overview

The Landfill is located at 600 East Gude Drive, Rockville, Maryland 20850. The site is accessed at two locations: East Gude Drive from the south-southwest and Southlawn Lane via Incinerator Lane from the east-southeast.

The Landfill is currently owned and maintained by the County Department of Environmental Protection. The Landfill was used for the disposal of municipal solid waste and incinerator residues from 1964 to 1982. The Landfill property encompasses approximately 162 acres, of which approximately 140 acres were used for waste disposal. An additional 17 acres of waste disposal area were delineated in 2009 on Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) property, beyond the northeastern property boundary of the Landfill. A land exchange between the County and M-NCPPC on October 21, 2014, transferred ownership of this additional waste disposal area to the County in exchange for a similar area of land without waste, which was transferred to M-NCPPC.

1.2.2 Site and Surrounding Area Land Use

The typical ground cover across the Landfill site is open grassy fields with patches of brushy vegetation and trees on most side slopes and along the perimeter borders of the Landfill. The existing LFG collection and conveyance system, including the flare station, gas extraction wells and wellheads, and gas conveyance piping, is situated above grade on the Landfill's ground surface. Six perched liquid dewatering sumps are located below grade on the northwest portion of the upper surface of the Landfill. The site also has a limited area on the top of the Landfill that was designated for flying model airplanes and a concrete pad near the Southlawn Lane facility entrance road that is used for managing storm-related debris.

The surrounding area and properties adjacent to the Landfill have mixed uses including parkland, industrial property, and residential development. Specifically, the adjacent land areas consist of:

- M-NCPPC land and Crabbs Branch Stream (north and northeast);
- Asphalt and cement production facilities, equipment storage yards, scrap metal recycling facilities, and Southlawn Lane (east and southeast);
- East Gude Drive, the 600 East Gude Drive campus (formerly occupied by County Coalition for the Homeless shelter and Community Ministries of Rockville men's shelter), WSSC Water property and Southlawn Branch Stream (southwest and south and southeast); and

- Transcontinental (Williams Gas)/Columbia Gas natural gas pipeline right-of-way and the community of Derwood Station residential development (west and northwest).

1.2.3 Site History

The Landfill was constructed and operated prior to current solid waste management disposal and facility design and closure standards that were implemented by EPA, under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Therefore, the Landfill was not originally constructed with a geosynthetic liner or compacted clay bottom liner, a leachate collection system, an LFG collection system, or a stormwater management system. Reportedly, soil was used as daily cover during waste filling, and a 2-foot (ft) (minimum) final layer of soil was reportedly placed over the waste mass during closure of the Landfill (in 1982) to support the vegetative cover.

Since 1982, the County has voluntarily, or through regulatory mandates, implemented and maintained Best Management Practices for pre-regulatory era landfills to ensure compliance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) requirements. These Best Management Practices include: soil and vegetative cover system installation, cover system maintenance, leachate seep repairs, LFG collection system installation and maintenance, water quality and LFG monitoring, and stormwater infrastructure. The County currently maintains an active LFG collection and conveyance system including: flares, over 100 gas extraction wells, and horizontal gas conveyance piping. A network of onsite and offsite groundwater monitoring wells; a network of onsite LFG monitoring wells; environmental monitoring programs for groundwater, surface water, and LFG; and stormwater are also maintained for the Landfill site.

1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

1.3.1 Topography

The site topography of the Landfill is plateau-like and consists of gentle relief (i.e., slope) along the top of the waste-mass and sharp relief along the perimeter property boundary. The elevation along the top of the plateau gently slopes to the south, with localized mounds and depressions throughout. The side-slope falls sharply from the top of the waste-mass to elevations ranging from 55 to 90 ft below the plateau.

1.3.2 Geology

The Landfill is located in central Montgomery County, Maryland, within the upland section of the Piedmont Plateau physiographic province (Maryland Geological Survey 1968; Trapp and Horn 1997). The geology in the upland section of the Piedmont Plateau physiographic province primarily consists of metamorphic and igneous rock formations of Paleozoic and Precambrian age. The Piedmont Plateau is underlain by an assortment of phyllite, slate, marble, schist, gneiss, and gabbro formations. Unconsolidated material overlying bedrock is present at the surface in the vicinity of the Landfill site and extends 20 to 60 ft below ground surface. Based on available groundwater monitoring well construction logs from ATEC Associates Inc. (1988) and more

recent boring logs (EA 2010 and 2011), the unconsolidated material consists primarily of silt and clay.

1.3.3 Hydrogeologic Setting

The uplands section of the Piedmont is underlain by three principle types of bedrock aquifers: crystalline-rock and undifferentiated sedimentary-rock aquifers, aquifers in early Mesozoic basins, and carbonate-rock aquifers (Trapp and Horn 1997). The Landfill is underlain by the crystalline rock aquifer that extends over approximately 86 percent of the Piedmont Plateau Physiographic Province. At the Landfill, the crystalline rock that comprises the regional aquifer is overlain by unconsolidated material consisting of interbedded silts and clays and saprolite. Recorded logs from onsite and offsite borings for the groundwater monitoring wells correlated well with these general geological descriptions.

Based on information from site boring logs and well gauging, groundwater is present in the unconsolidated material, as well as the bedrock at the Landfill site. The groundwater table is typically present in the unconsolidated material along the perimeter of the Landfill and under the Derwood Station development, at depths ranging from approximately 3 to 60 ft below ground surface. Groundwater recharge at the Landfill is variable and is primarily determined by precipitation and runoff. Topographic relief, unconsolidated material, and surface recharge variations created by the Landfill may significantly affect the groundwater flow.

Groundwater flow is highly dependent on the composition and grain size of the sediments, and therefore water likely moves more readily in the unconsolidated material than in the underlying bedrock. Groundwater in the bedrock (typically 20 to 60 ft below grade) is stored in, and moves through, fractures. No documentation of the degree of fracturing or orientation of bedrock fractures at the Landfill is available.

The site topography and the natural cover system (grassy surface and soil layer) of the Landfill may allow surface water infiltration. Some of the infiltrating water likely moves vertically into the bedrock, while a portion also moves laterally along the boundary between the unconsolidated material and the surface of the bedrock and discharges to nearby streams and surface depressions.

1.3.4 Groundwater Flow

Based on the data collected from new and existing groundwater monitoring wells, including temporary groundwater monitoring wells, the groundwater flow direction was inferred. The data indicated that groundwater flows in an easterly flow direction across the Landfill site, with minor northerly, northeasterly, and southeasterly flow components.

1.4 DESIGN CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

As part of EA's design contract, EA has developed quality and communication plans to document the approach to different aspects of the project.

EA developed a project-specific Quality Management Plan based on its Corporate Quality Management Plan. This plan includes detailed roles and responsibilities for all levels of staff.

A project-specific Communication Plan has been developed to identify communications pathways throughout the project. This Plan will be updated as necessary through the life of the project.

EA has developed a Stakeholder Engagement Plan that includes a list of stakeholders from the County, the Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority (the Authority), Gude Landfill Concerned Citizens, Derwood community, neighboring businesses, and regulatory personnel from MDE, M-NCPPC, and the Department of Permitting Services. The plan also includes a communication framework that is designed to continue to build community, share information, develop a framework of understanding, and obtain input on the project.

This page intentionally left blank

2. PRE-DESIGN INVESTIGATION

2.1 SITE SPECIFIC HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN

EA developed a site-specific Health and Safety Plan to address worker safety associated with planned field activities. A Site Safety Officer will be provided during all fieldwork performed during the course of the project. The Health and Safety Plan was prepared with the oversight by a Certified Industrial Hygienist and is in compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and EA's Corporate Health and Safety Plan. All field personnel are required to review the document and sign the review record located within the plan. The Site Safety Officer will also highlight the contents of the plan with field staff prior to beginning fieldwork as has historically been performed with work at the Landfill. The plan includes site communications, confined space avoidance, site hazards, personal protective equipment, and vehicle safety information, as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

2.2 SURVEY

EA's subcontractor, Wallace Montgomery, performed an aerial flyover and field-run topographic survey of the site in May/June 2018. This work is an update to the survey performed by Wallace Montgomery in 2015, and focuses on providing the most accurate existing conditions, for use as the base mapping in the design documents and estimating material quantities. The aerial survey provided updated mapping for identifiable physical and topographic features, while the field-run survey supplemented items not completely captured by the aerial survey. The horizontal control for the project is relative to the North American Datum of 1983 and the vertical control is relative to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988. A copy of the sealed survey drawings is included in **Attachment A**.

2.3 UTILITY LOCATION

EA subcontracted Master Locators of Baltimore to provide utility designation and mapping services. Master Locators performed utility designation and mapping using electromagnetic and ground-penetrating radar. Master Locators identified natural gas, electric, communications, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and water lines within the scope of work boundaries and approximate Landfill property line. A copy of the utility locating report is included in **Attachment B**.

2.4 GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

EA installed four temporary piezometers in 2015 to verify the depth of waste and groundwater within the Landfill footprint in order to determine potential performance of toupee capping as the approved CMA. Cover soil ranged from 5 to 10 ft in depth, with the majority consisting of brown, silty, median grain sandy fill. The more recent LFG extraction well logs also document varying depths of cover soil along the northwest slope, ranging from 2 ft in some locations to greater than 10 ft in areas closer to the access road.

As part of the design of the toupee cap for the Landfill, a geotechnical investigation was required to obtain additional information to characterize the existing cover system, waste mass location (depth to waste), and subsurface conditions across the Landfill site.

The Robert B. Balter Company performed test pits across the Landfill to identify the thickness and properties of the existing cover soil in July 2018. Bulk samples of representative soils were recovered for laboratory evaluation. Laboratory analysis included soil classification according to the Unified Soils Classification System, moisture content analysis, sieve gradation analysis, Atterberg limits determination, and modified Proctor tests. Existing cover soil thicknesses ranged from 1.5 to 8 ft. The existing cover soils were found to consist of sand and silt mixtures, sand and clay mixtures, and clays. Discussion on how the results of the test pitting investigation were used in the design is included in Section 4.5.1.1. A copy of the geotechnical evaluation report is included in **Attachment C**.

2.5 NATIONAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FOREST STAND DELINEATION/ FOREST CONSERVATION PLAN

EA conducted a Natural Resource Inventory including a full Forest Stand Delineation and a Wetland Delineation to identify the existing resources at the project site and within the first 200 ft of adjoining land. Narratives were prepared to include discussion on the site conditions, methodology, site photographs, data forms, figures, and agency correspondence. The Forest Stand Delineation and Wetland Delineation were approved by M-NCPPC in August 2019. The Forest Stand Delineation Report and the Wetland Delineation Report are included in **Attachment D**.

A Forest Conservation Plan was developed to support the permitting and project review process following the guidelines provided by Montgomery County and the State of Maryland. The Forest Conservation Plan addresses the forest resources within the project area to remain undisturbed and the mechanisms for their protection. The Forest Conservation Plan also includes details on the reforestation and/or afforestation requirements that may be associated with the proposed design. The Forest Conservation Plan is currently under review by M-NCPPC.

2.6 TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

EA's subcontractor T3 Design was contracted to perform a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the project. This study includes data collection, analysis, and preparation of a TIS. The TIS documents existing traffic conditions along Southlawn Lane and East Gude Drive near the Landfill. The TIS also evaluates projected future traffic conditions and models the traffic impacts based on volume of construction vehicles for the remediation project activities. The TIS is included as **Attachment E**. Requirements for a traffic control plan were developed and included in the Contract Documents, as part of the Project Manual.

2.7 LANDFILL GAS INVESTIGATION

The MDE-Approved CMA is for toupee capping and additional LFG collection, specifically identified for the Northwest, West, and Southwest Areas of the Landfill. In addition to areas

identified for proposed LFG extraction wells, existing LFG extraction wells needed to be evaluated. The original LFG collection system and landfill gas-to-energy (LFGE) facility at the Gude Landfill became operational in 1985, with the enclosed flare installed in 2005, and expansion of the collection system occurring through 2008. The current LFGE system was connected to the grid in 2009, and subsequently ceased operations on June 1, 2017. Since 2008, an additional 27 LFG extraction wells were installed, mainly to assist with LFG migration in the Northwest, West, and Southwest Areas. EA reviewed the operational history, data, and issues with the system as part of the Nature and Extent Study. An LFG technical memorandum is included in **Attachment F**.

This page intentionally left blank

3. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

A Permit Compliance Report has been prepared to present the permits and approvals that are required for the project, the reviewing agencies for each permit, and a description of the permit application process with anticipated timelines. The Permit Compliance Report is included in **Attachment G**.

This page intentionally left blank

4. DESIGN ELEMENTS

The following section details the assumptions, design considerations, and determinations associated with the Landfill remediation design.

4.1 STAGING AND STOCKPILE AREAS

Staging areas will be required to accommodate the contractor's office trailers, the owner and construction management engineer's trailer, employee parking, and equipment and non-soil material storage. Stockpile areas will be required for soil and aggregate storage. There is not enough area for staging and stockpiling at the site outside of the limit of disturbance; therefore, these areas will be located on the Landfill. An administration area is proposed for the location of the existing LFG facility. Activities for this area will be limited to contractor's, and the owner and construction management engineer's office trailers and employee parking. No equipment will be stored at the administration area. The existing concrete pad on the east side of Incinerator Lane on the upper surface of the Landfill has been identified as an initial staging area for equipment and non-soil material storage. The Contractor will need to perform improvements to the area to remove low spots where water currently ponds and provide necessary erosion and sediment controls for the area. The location of the initial staging area is identified on Contract Drawing C-121. This area may be used for staging for the majority of the project but will eventually be removed to accommodate closure cap construction in that area. Stockpile areas have not been identified on the Contract Drawings because the Contractor will have the flexibility to choose temporary stockpile locations for each phase of work. Locations of the staging and stockpile areas may change as the construction progresses. Re-locating staging and stockpile areas will increase the cost of the project, so the design is intended to minimize the need to re-locate them.

4.2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE

Based on the results of the evaluation presented in the ACM Report, the approved CMA is toupee capping and additional LFG collection. Toupee capping would decrease the volume of leachate generated due to the reduction of infiltration on the top of the Landfill.

To meet the RAOs for LFG migration and leachate seep control, the capping system will extend along the northwest and west slopes of the Landfill. The Landfill waste currently extends to the property boundary on the northwest and west sides; therefore, to accommodate the Landfill cap and to provide for vehicular access, drainage control, and tree planting along the northwest and west slopes, waste relocation and regrading will be required in this area.

The remaining perimeter of the Landfill, on the north, east, and south sides, consists of steep slopes with dense tree cover, both of which significantly reduce rainwater infiltration potential, thus reducing potential leachate generation. These slopes will not be disturbed during construction. This is consistent with the approved CMA presented in the ACM Report.

Waste relocated from the northwest slope will be placed on top of the Landfill to increase the slope of the ground surface to promote positive drainage. The relocated waste will be used for regrading

activities to achieve subgrade elevations. The waste material will be compacted and any protruding objects that could damage the closure cap will be removed. Areas with waste placement will be compacted and covered with a minimum of 1 ft of soil, prior to placement of the closure cap.

MDE has previously indicated verbally that reconfiguration of waste onsite is acceptable as part of this project. During the 30 percent design meeting with MDE in November 2018, waste relocation was discussed and documented in the presentation and meeting minutes. Additional grading and relocation of waste will be required to meet the proposed grades and promote adequate drainage. A primary consideration in developing the grading was balancing the cut and fill to minimize the need to bring soil from offsite to meet the proposed grades. Regrading onsite material is more sustainable and less costly than hauling in soil from offsite.

The Landfill grading will improve drainage on top of the Landfill by increasing the slopes from the existing condition to the final condition. Analysis of the existing and proposed grades is shown in **Figure 1** and **Figure 2**, respectively. **Table 1** presents the reduction of flatter slope areas from the existing condition to the final condition.

Table 1 Slope Areas

Slope Range	Existing (square feet)	Proposed (square feet)	Reduction in Area (percent)
Slope Area Between 0% and 1%	452,444	89,480	80
Slope Area Between 1% and 2%	901,909	240,823	73
Slope Area Between 2% and 3%	1,089,640	668,044	39
Slope Area Between 3% and 4%	1,058,397	549,187	48
Total			
Slope Area Between 0% and 4%	3,502,390	1,547,534	56

The grading approach considers existing drainage patterns. The grading has been developed such that the pre-development runoff characteristics are maintained to the greatest extent practicable after development.

Drainage on the upper surface of the Landfill is conveyed primarily by a network of open channel swales. The swales convey drainage to existing Pond 3 or to existing stormdrain networks along the perimeter of the Landfill. Stormwater runoff on the west and northwest slope will be conveyed by benches and downchutes to a swale at the base of the slope. A facility has been designed at the low point of the swale to discharge stormwater as sheet flow offsite.

Downchutes will be constructed with gabion baskets. EA evaluated using gabion baskets compared to alternative lining methods such as concrete-lined channels. It was determined that the construction costs and performance of both materials were similar. EA is proposing gabion downchutes since they have often been constructed on other Montgomery County sites and maintenance staff will be familiar with maintenance procedures.

4.2.1 Global Slope Stability

A global slope stability analysis will be performed in future design phases to ensure the regraded west and northwest slope will be stable during and after construction. It is not anticipated that slope stability will be a concern because the west and northwest slope has been graded to a maximum 3H:1V slope based on the *2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control* land grading practices. The proposed grading and cap construction included in the current design will not have an impact on the stability of slopes around the remaining perimeter of the Landfill since the slopes will remain undisturbed and increases in Landfill elevation are primarily in the middle of the Landfill and not near the tops of the slopes.

4.3 CONSTRUCTION PHASING

The design includes a phased construction approach. Grading will be limited to 20-acre areas based on the limit imposed by the *2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*. Two series of phases have been developed for construction. Subgrade construction has been divided into seven phases (S-I through S-VII). Closure cap construction has been divided into six phases (F-I through F-VI). The proposed phases have been defined based on balancing cut and fill of onsite material and based on erosion and sediment control measures as described in Section 4.11. The phases have been defined such that the Contractor must complete the closure cap construction of the west and northwest slope prior to construction on the upper surface and eastern portion of the Landfill.

A phased approach to the LFG collection system construction is also proposed. Additional description about the LFG collection system phasing is included in the sequence of construction on the Contract Drawings.

The proposed grading plan requires both excavation and fill. The grading plan has been optimized to balance the excavation and fill quantities below the cap geosynthetics to the greatest extent practicable. There are several areas where waste will be excavated.

4.4 WASTE EXCAVATION AND HANDLING

Care must be taken during waste handling to identify any potentially unsafe or hazardous conditions, minimize the migration and infiltration of stormwater into areas of disturbance, prevent migration of non-stormwater discharges (e.g., leachate), prevent oxygen intrusion into the waste mass in areas where the gas system remains active, and minimize odors, dust, and vectors. Specification Section 02 61 13.13 provides detailed requirements for waste excavation and handling, which includes daily covering of waste with tarps or a minimum of 6 inches (in.) of soil, management of any leachate encountered, management of odors and dust, and waste grading and compaction requirements. The specifications include the identification of cover soil, waste, and unusual waste materials.

4.5 CLOSURE CAP

The objective of the Landfill closure cap design is to minimize the impact of the Landfill on the surrounding environment to the greatest extent possible. Landfill capping will minimize the infiltration of stormwater through the waste and the potential migration of LFG and the potential migration and/or discharge of Landfill non-stormwater discharges (e.g., leachate). Several closure cap types are proposed. The type of closure cap proposed varies depending on the location on the Landfill. The cross-sections for the different closure cap types are depicted on the Contract Drawings.

4.5.1 Geosynthetic Closure Cap

The majority of the Landfill will be covered with a geosynthetic closure cap. The components, building up from the subgrade, are described in the following sections.

4.5.1.1 Subgrade

Based on the geotechnical evaluation performed by the Robert B. Balter Company, existing cover soil thicknesses at the test pit locations ranged from 1.5 to 8 ft. The test pits indicated cover soil thickness averaged 2 ft and the design requires the Contractor to excavate and segregate existing soil cover for use in the closure construction.

The existing ground will be cleared and grubbed before grading commences. The Contractor will be required to excavate existing cover soil in areas where waste excavation and placement will occur and stockpile that soil to re-cover the waste after it is graded and compacted.

One foot of subgrade will be provided over all areas of regraded waste before the cap geosynthetics are placed. The subgrade will be compacted to serve as a stable base for the cap section.

4.5.1.2 Geotextile

An 8-ounce nonwoven needle-punched geotextile will be placed between the subgrade and geomembrane. While not required by COMAR, this layer provides a higher interface friction angle with the subgrade and serves to protect the geomembrane from puncture. A calculation to verify that the proposed geotextile provides adequate puncture resistance is included in the geosynthetics calculations in **Attachment I**.

4.5.1.3 Geomembrane

The geomembrane serves as the impermeable barrier of the cap to prevent transfer of materials both into and out of the closed Landfill. COMAR 26.04.07.21 requires a low-permeability layer within the closure cap and specifies that when using a synthetic material as the cap's low-permeability layer, the material must have a minimum thickness of 20 mil and a maximum permeability of 1×10^{-10} centimeters per second. A 40-mil textured linear low-density

polyethylene geomembrane is specified in the design to satisfy this requirement due to its thickness, low permeability, high friction angle, interface cohesion, and durability.

It is imperative that the geomembrane not be punctured when installing the closure cap as this will cause unacceptable material transfer between the Landfill and the exterior environment. Procedures for care during the installation of closure cap materials during construction and minimum puncture strength requirements will be specified in the Technical Specifications.

4.5.1.4 Geocomposite Drainage Layer

A drainage layer is required in a closure cap to provide a means for water that infiltrates through the cover soil to be conveyed to an outlet to prevent an unacceptable buildup of pore pressure within the cover soil. Increased pore pressure can create instability between cap components and cover soil and lead to sloughing. COMAR 26.14.07.21 requires that a drainage layer be installed immediately above the low-permeability layer and allows for filter fabrics and drainage blankets to be used for this purpose.

Calculations were prepared to evaluate the capacity of the proposed geocomposite at multiple locations on the Landfill. It was determined that a 300-mil geocomposite drainage layer is adequate for conveying drainage. These calculations are included in the geosynthetics calculations in **Attachment I**.

4.5.1.5 Vegetative Support Soil

COMAR 26.04.07.21 states that a minimum of 2 ft of earthen cover shall be placed over the drainage layer with a minimum cover slope of 4 percent. The material is required to contain sufficient organic material and nutrients to sustain a vegetative cover over time. A vegetative support soil layer of thickness 1 ft 8 in. with a 4-in. layer of topsoil is specified in the design.

To ensure that the geocomposite drainage layer does not become clogged by the vegetative support soil, the vegetative support soil grain size must be specified based on the apparent opening size of the geocomposite. A calculation for the vegetative support soil grain size is included in the geosynthetics calculations in **Attachment I**.

4.5.1.6 Alternate Geosynthetic Closure Cap Section

An alternate closure cap section is included on the design drawings. The County may elect to have the Contractor use a material that combines the geomembrane and geocomposite drainage layer instead of using two separate materials. EA determined that the 50-mil linear low-density polyethylene Agru MicroDrain product will provide an equivalent drainage capacity and permeability as the standard closure cap section. The drainage layers of both closure cap sections are specified to provide a transmissivity of 7.5×10^{-4} square meters per second. The use of this alternate material has saved construction costs for several landfill sites in Maryland.

4.5.1.7 Geosynthetic Closure Cap Stability

Capping materials were selected to ensure the long-term stability of the cap between the interfaces of the various cap components. A veneer slope stability analysis was performed to confirm an adequate factor of safety using infinite slope and finite slope theory for the closure cap configuration. The critical interfaces were evaluated on the longest slopes of the Landfill.

EA has designed the capping system with a minimum factor of safety of 1.5 for slope stability for each interface as is typical for projects of this nature and magnitude. A calculation for the stability of the Landfill cap is included in the geosynthetics calculations in **Attachment I**.

4.5.2 Earth Closure Cap

An earth closure cap is proposed in the area of Pond 3 because it is a low-lying area and a geocomposite drainage layer would not be able to drain to surrounding grade. COMAR 26.04.07.21 requires a low-permeability layer within the closure cap and specifies that when using an earthen material as the cap's low-permeability layer, the material must have a minimum thickness of 1 ft and a maximum permeability of 1×10^{-5} centimeters per second. The earth closure cap will contain a 2-ft-thick low-permeability soil layer with a permeability 1×10^{-5} centimeters per second. It will be covered with 4 in. of topsoil to promote vegetative stabilization. In the final condition, the pond will be decommissioned and no ponded water will be present on the cap.

4.5.3 Vegetative Stabilization

COMAR 26.04.07.21 requires that within 30 days after the final earthen cover has been installed, the area shall be vegetatively stabilized using a perennial cover species recommended by the Soil Conservation District. Seed mixes for permanent vegetative stabilization include native meadow and wildflower species over most of the Landfill area.

4.6 ACCESS ROADS

A network of gravel access roads is proposed for the upper surface of the Landfill. Gravel access roads will either be crowned or superelevated for drainage. Details for the gravel access road sections are included on Contract Drawing C-503.

4.7 LANDFILL GAS MANAGEMENT

4.7.1 Existing System Description

The existing LFG collection and conveyance system at the Landfill consists of a network of vertical LFG extraction wells, with mainly above-grade polyvinyl chloride (PVC) conveyance piping. There are three known sumps within the system for the collection of condensate, which are periodically pumped out, as necessary. The original LFG collection and conveyance system and LFGE facility at the Landfill became operational in 1985, with the enclosed flare installed in 2005, and expansion of the collection system occurring through 2008. The current LFGE system was installed and connected to the grid in 2009, and subsequently ceased operations on June 1, 2017.

Since 2008, an additional 27 LFG extraction wells were installed, mainly to assist with LFG migration in the Northwest, West, and Southwest Areas. LFG is currently managed by the two enclosed flares installed in 2005. Details regarding the existing LFG collection system are presented in **Attachment F**.

4.7.2 Anticipated LFG Production

EA used the EPA Landfill Gas Emissions Model (LandGEM) to estimate LFG production to be used as the design basis. This information was used as the basis for determining the required well spacing and the locations for proposed LFG extraction wells. Based on the historical waste disposal records and estimates provided by the County during the preparation of the ACM, the anticipated LFG production was determined. Records indicate that the Landfill received an estimated volume of 5.16 million tons of waste throughout its operational years (1965 to 1982). A conservative capture efficiency of 75 percent was assumed for the EPA LandGEM analysis, which is included in **Attachment F**. The existing capture efficiency was not further evaluated since it is anticipated to vary from the existing due to the installation of a new gas collection and conveyance system and toupee cap. The quality of the gas was utilized as 50 percent methane in the model, although it is anticipated that the captured methane may range from 30 to 50 percent.

In the analysis, projected future LFG flow rates range from 60 to 475 standard cubic feet per minute (scfm) from calendar year 2018 to 2070, with an approximate mean value of 201 scfm (**Figure 3**).




Figure 3 Projected LFG Production from LandGEM Model

Based on the LandGEM results, peak LFG production (1,925 scfm) occurred in 1983, approximately a year after the Landfill stopped accepting waste. The average LFG collection observed from November 2017 to April 2018 was 507 scfm. Due to the general agreement in observed LFG flow with the LandGEM model, an LFG production value of 507 scfm was utilized for the design basis. Based on 2019 monitoring data (January through November) collected by APTIM, the current LFG flow rate as measured at the flare station ranged from 354 to 734 scfm, with an average of 458 scfm. Therefore, 507 scfm is still considered conservative, but within the operational range currently observed.

4.7.3 System Design Details

The proposed LFG collection system will consist of the following primary components:

- Extraction wells (existing and proposed) with well heads for monitoring and control;
- New below-grade collection system piping (including laterals and header piping, and isolation valves);
- New condensate drains; and
- Existing blower-flare facility with:
 - Enclosed flares,
 - Blowers (primary and standby), and
 - Condensate knockout.

The existing LFG collection and conveyance system at the Landfill consists of a network of vertical LFG extraction wells, with mainly above-grade PVC conveyance piping. A substantial portion of the existing extraction well network and collection system of Landfill has been impacted due to the infrastructure age, waste settlement, and above-grade piping, which has been exposed to weather throughout the years. The existing collection system header and lateral piping will be demolished as the collection system will be re-designed and replaced with below-grade collection system piping to be connected with the existing enclosed flare system. Construction is to be phased to allow for the continual operation of the landfill gas collection and conveyance system in a manner that minimizes odors, LFG migration, and oxygen intrusion. The existing condensate sumps, traps, and drains within the Landfill will be disconnected and abandoned; however, a condensate sump located outside of the proposed cap prior to the LFG blower skid will remain. Based on the slope of the finished grade, condensate drains are proposed to be installed at the potential low points of the proposed LFG collection system to manage the condensate generated within the landfill. Additional evaluation of the proposed condensate management within the Landfill and at the blower-flare station is included in **Attachment J**.

4.7.4 Landfill Gas Extraction Well Network

There is currently a total of 116 LFG extraction wells located at the Landfill, 104 of which are operable and are monitored monthly for LFG quality. As of April 2020, 35 of the LFG extraction wells are currently operating in the fully closed position (i.e., no flow). Based on the existing well locations, available methane content, and radius of influence calculation, 66 wells were identified to be utilized after modification and 49 existing extraction wells are scheduled for abandonment, as shown on the Contract Drawings.

Details of existing extraction wells to be abandoned and modified are provided in **Attachment F**. Abandonment of existing extraction wells was based primarily on poor well performance, not on an anticipated reduction in LFG generation.

Twenty wells were investigated to determine their potential to be reused in the proposed LFG collection system. Based on the available methane content in these wells, four wells—EW-4,

EW-16, EW-100, and EW-157—were selected to be utilized; the remaining 16 wells were selected to be abandoned (**Attachment F**, Table 7). The existing and proposed LFG extraction wells will have flow control valves and will be connected to a common collection system header.

The placement of the existing extraction wells typically ranges from every 200 to 500 ft in triangular orientation. Well spacing was compared to a calculated radius of influence. Utilizing the current LFG production rate, total waste placement, and average well depth, the approximate radius of influence was calculated (**Attachment K**). The radius of influence was calculated utilizing an EPA method based on the New Source Performance Standard Background Information Document, Appendix E, dated 1991, and was based on the LFG production of 507 scfm. The calculated radius of influence was then used to calculate the well spacing. This calculation yielded a spacing range of 246 ft to 972 ft. Based on the calculated radius of influence range and considering the LFG extraction capacity of the existing system, a conservative typical radius of influence of approximately 150 ft was chosen. New extraction wells will be placed so that the radius of influence is tangential to the perimeter to control any LFG migration off of the waste boundary and also in the interior of the Landfill to control LFG emissions and promote cap stability. Based on the calculated spacing requirement, a total of 30 new extraction wells along with 66 existing wells are required as identified on the Contract Drawings. **Figure 4** depicts the LFG system layout with an estimated radius of influence for each well.

The vertical extraction wells will be constructed of high-density polyethylene. The bottom portion of the wells will be placed in the waste and is perforated to provide a preferential pathway for the LFG. The upper portion, minimum 20 ft, of the well will be constructed of solid pipe casing to prevent non-LFG intrusion. The perforated interval will be surrounded in the boring with a filter pack or non-calcareous (i.e., non-chemically reactive) aggregate. A bentonite seal will be placed just above the filter pack, native soil or common borrow will be placed and compacted above the filter pack seal, and a membrane boot seal will be created around the geomembrane.

A wellhead will be used to connect the extraction well to the below grade collection system. The wellhead provides flow adjustment, gas monitoring, flow measurement, and leachate extraction, if needed.

Details of the extraction wells and well heads are provided on the Contract Drawings.

4.7.5 Landfill Gas Collection System Piping

The existing LFG collection system is currently positioned on the surface of the Landfill and has been susceptible to damage caused by weather and waste settlement. Buried collection system piping within the Landfill closure cap will provide a better solution to the prevailing issues, given that the Landfill settlement and appropriate slope will be considered in the design for the collection system. The buried LFG collection system will be placed just above the closure cap drainage layer to allow for maintenance without impacting the cap geosynthetics. Trenching details for both inside and outside of the Landfill cap are provided on the Contract Drawings.

The layout of the collection piping is designed to target a minimum 3 percent slope throughout the system to allow for effective condensate drainage; however, the Landfill slopes are flatter than 3 percent in some areas, so some segments of piping are as flat as 1 percent. This minimum slope range is based on the final grades and the desire to keep LFG collection piping above the geosynthetic liner. All extraction wells will be connected by lateral pipes and a perimeter looped header pipe. The looped header provides the advantage of self-equalizing or balancing of the vacuum and flow as well as allowing operating personnel to pull LFG from either direction, thus providing flexibility in situations of blockages or header repair. The LFG wells that are located downhill of the header pipe or outside of the Landfill cap are on an extended lateral from the looped header. A modified wellhead is proposed for these remote wells as depicted on the Drawings. The LFG piping will be constructed of SDR 17 high-density polyethylene for its durability and agility in underground installations.

Pipe sizing and pressure drop calculations are provided in **Attachment K**.

4.7.6 Landfill Gas Condensate Collection

As LFG is extracted from the Landfill and transported through the LFG collection system, it gradually cools and a liquid (condensate) is formed. The LFG condensate is primarily made up of water and typically contains minimal quantities of volatile and miscible compounds and can have similar composition to leachate. The layout of the LFG piping is designed to maintain positive drainage to condensate drains in low-lying areas. Where possible, the pipe network is designed so the condensate drainage is oriented with the flow direction of the LFG to minimize pipe surging.

As presented in the Condensate Quantity and Quality Evaluation technical memorandum (**Attachment J**), condensate generated at the Landfill is currently managed with the use of three sumps, several condensate traps, and at least one self-draining condensate trap that currently drains back to the Landfill. Additionally, there is a condensate knockout located at the blower skid that drains to a below-grade condensate sump within the fenced area for the enclosed flares.

As part of the improvements to the LFG collection and conveyance system, the existing condensate sumps, traps, and drains are to be disconnected and abandoned along with the existing above-grade LFG collection system; however, the condensate sumps located outside of the proposed cap located at the inlet to the LFG blower skid will remain. There is a total of 29 condensate drains proposed to be installed at the potential low points of the proposed LFG collection system, based on the slope of the finished grade. The number of condensate drains are to minimize operational issues such as accumulation and blockage of the header pipe due to condensate in areas where the grade of the landfill is less than 3 percent.

A list of proposed condensate drains is provided on the Contract Drawings. The volume of condensate generated can be appropriately managed by the proposed condensate drains and the sump located at the inlet to the blower skid (**Attachment K**).

EA reviewed the existing LFG extraction wells and proposed condensate drain locations to determine potential dry areas where introduction of condensate may generate additional LFG.

Dry areas were identified where the drains are in close proximity to the extraction wells that currently contain no water. Since condensate generated from the LFG are proposed to drain back to the landfill, additional LFG generation may occur in these dry areas. Based on the review, 10 potential dry areas were identified (**Table 2**).

EA also conducted a sensitivity analysis for the potential production of LFG for the scenario where the waste is either wet or dry; the LFG production rate modeled varied between 356 scfm (wet condition methane generation rate, $k=0.05$) and 508 scfm (dry condition methane generation rate, $k=0.03$) in year 2020 (**Figure 5**). For the purposes of the basis of design, EA utilized $k = 0.04$ based on the Inventory Conventional method since it aligned with the actual LFG production rates at the landfill more closely than other methods. It can be assumed that the differences in moisture content of the waste due to pre- and-post capping conditions, as well as the reintroduction of condensate are not significant enough to impact the overall design and the performance of the landfill gas collection and conveyance system proposed.




Figure 5 Projected LFG Production Comparison.

Based on overall LFG collection and conveyance system design, it can be concluded that the LFG system is adequately designed and robust enough to handle the additional LFG generation from condensate. Identified potential dry locations are presented in **Figure 6**.

Table 2 Condensate Drain Summary

Condensate Drain No.	Nearest LFG Extraction Wells (square feet)		Additional LFG Generation Anticipated (Yes/No)
	Well ID	Well Condition*	
CD-1	EW-100	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-2	EW-105	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-3	EW-125	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-4	EW-12	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-5	EW-14	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-6	EW-7	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-7	EW-15	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-8	EW-17	High Methane and Water	No
CD-9	EW-19	Abandoned	Yes
CD-10	EW-40	Abandoned	Yes
CD-11	EW-40	Abandoned	Yes
CD-12	EW-40	Abandoned	Yes
CD-13	EW-35	High Methane and Water	No
CD-14	EW-35	High Methane and Water	No
CD-15	EW-35	High Methane and Water	No
CD-16	EW-31	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-17	EW-149	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-18	EW-149	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-19	EW-148	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-20	EW-145	High Methane and Water	No
CD-21	EW-22	High Methane and Water	No
CD-22	EW-21	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-23	EW-4	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-24	EW-76	High Methane and No Water	Yes
CD-25	EW-62	Low Methane and Water	No
CD-26	EW-36	High Methane and Water	No
CD-27	EW-103	High Methane and Water	No
CD-28	EW-104	High Methane and Water	No
CD-29	EW-152	High Methane and Water	No

Notes:
* Refer to Figure-1 included in the LFG Investigation Technical Memorandum (**Attachment F**).
Location of Condensate Drains presented on **Figure 6.

4.7.7 Blower-Flare Facility

A blower applies the required vacuum on the LFG collection system and supplies the required discharge pressure for the flare. The amount of vacuum required depends on the size of the LFG collection system and typically varies from 40 to 80 in. of water column (the existing system currently operates at 82 in. of water column). The amount of pressure required is governed by the flare burner configuration and typically varies from 10 to 20 in. of water column.

As presented in the LFG Investigation technical memorandum, the existing facility has three 20-horsepower blowers in operation, each rated for 600 scfm at 60 in. of water column that are utilized to convey LFG from the collection system to two enclosed flares. The County is currently

in the process of installing new variable frequency drives to allow for improving control of the vacuum on the Landfill in the future. The enclosed flares are each rated for 600 scfm at 50 percent methane. If the methane concentration falls below 30 percent, propane, which is stored onsite, can be used to supplement the LFG to maintain combustion. The existing permit to construct and the as-built drawings for the enclosed flares are included in **Attachment F**. As part of the LFGE project, a butterfly valve and line were installed to direct LFG to the pretreatment skid associated with the LFGE system. It is EA's understanding that this valve was closed June 1, 2017, as part of the LFGE plant shutdown that occurred.

The existing blower/flare station is located at the Gude Drive entrance of the Landfill, adjacent to the LFGE facility that is no longer in use. The blowers were designed to function under a range of conditions that may result due to changes in LFG composition and flow rate. Based on the existing blower/flare facility's capacity (1,200 scfm), location, and current LFG production rate (507 scfm), it is assumed that the existing facility is capable of managing LFG from the new LFG collection system. The existing facility has three blowers each rated for at 600 scfm with a turndown percentage of 73 percent; therefore, each blower can operate at collected LFG flow rate as low as 162 scfm. The existing facility has two flares each rated for at 600 scfm with a turndown percentage of 5 percent; therefore, each flare can operate at a LFG flow as low as 30 scfm at 50 percent methane. The LFG flow rate is predicted to be 168 scfm in 2044 (assuming a significant increase in LFG production does not occur due to capping) according to the LandGEM analysis (**Figure 3**). Based on the modeled LFG production and projected collection rate and the turndown of the blowers, the existing facility is anticipated to be able to collect and convey the LFG until 2044. This evaluation only accounts for the capacity of the equipment and does not take into other considerations such as useful life of the equipment or maintenance of the facility.

4.8 DEWATERING SUMPS

There are currently six, 12-inch diameter high-density polyethylene dewatering sumps located on top of the landfill. These sumps have historically been utilized to dewater the site, specifically in areas along the northwest slope where leachate seeps have historically occurred. The Contractor is to utilize these sumps for dewatering of the northwest slope prior to waste excavation and extend them for future use, if needed.

4.9 GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELLS

The existing groundwater monitoring network for the Landfill consists of 51 groundwater monitoring wells. The project specifications will require the Contractor to protect the existing groundwater monitoring wells within the limit of work during construction. The Gude Landfill ACM, dated April 2016 (EA 2016), included a Work Plan for the Recommended CMA—toupee capping and additional LFG collection. As part of the Work Plan, a total of 9 groundwater monitoring well shallow and deep pairs (18 total groundwater monitoring wells) was proposed. In 2017, 12 of these wells were installed (MW-16A/B, MW-19A/B, MW-21A/B, MW-22A/B, MW-23A/B, MW-24A/B), per the updated Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring Plan. MW-17A/B and MW-18A/B (along the west/northwestern property boundary) are in an area that

will be impacted by the capping project; therefore, the County plans to install these well pairs following construction under a separate contract.

4.10 PIEZOMETERS

As part of the ACM (EA 2016), EA installed four piezometers into waste to evaluate groundwater elevations within the landfill. As part of the capping project these piezometers are to be made permanent and extended with the capping of the landfill. It is anticipated that the County will continue to utilize these piezometers to monitor groundwater elevations and mounding within the landfill following the capping of the landfill.

4.11 LANDFILL GAS MONITORING WELLS

The existing LFG monitoring network for the Landfill consists of 24 permanent LFG compliance monitoring wells along the southern and northwestern property boundaries of the site. Ten of the 24 LFG monitoring wells were installed in June 2010 and seven were installed in December 2016. The project specifications will require the Contractor to protect the existing LFG monitoring wells within the limit of work during construction.

4.12 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

An Environmental Assessment Report was developed to describe potential construction phase and long-term environmental effects resulting from construction activities. Potential effects of construction include changes to traffic, dust, noise, odor, LFG migration, non-stormwater discharges (e.g., leachate), stormwater runoff, fuel storage, site access, security, and safety, habitat and natural resources, recreation, and site aesthetics. The environmental assessment identifies potential measures to minimize, mitigate, and eliminate the potential effects. Relevant resources, current and potential land uses, and potential positive and negative effects are described. The Environmental Assessment Report is included in **Attachment L**.

4.13 EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

Erosion on construction sites can be a significant source of sediment pollution to nearby bodies of water. As a result, there are regulations that require construction activities to employ adequate controls to limit the amount of sediment traveling offsite through runoff. This is accomplished through conveying sediment-laden runoff through filtering or sediment-trapping practices prior to discharge offsite. All erosion and sediment control facilities are required to meet design and maintenance criteria as outlined in the *2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*.

The construction phases have been developed to promote positive drainage from the current phase to the greatest extent possible. Super silt fence is proposed along the phase boundaries to ensure that runoff is filtered prior to leaving the work area. Localized sump areas may develop during grading activities, and the Contract Documents require that the Contractor pump and filter runoff in those areas after storm events.

The progression of grading on the west and northwest slope is shown on the Contract Drawings. The excavation will begin at the top of the slope and work downward in stages. Super silt fence will be placed on the downslope of the excavation area. Construction of benches, temporary gabion outlet structures, temporary stone outlet structures, pipe slope drains, mountable berms, earth dikes, clean water diversions, and other controls are detailed on the Contract Drawings.

Existing Pond 3 will be converted to Sediment Basin No. 1 during construction to manage sediment laden water from the east side of the site. The sediment basin has been designed in accordance with MDE and Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services (DPS) requirements and can treat over 48 acres of drainage area. The phasing has been designed to limit the drainage area to the basin to less than 48 acres in all phases.

After construction is complete, the basin will be decommissioned, and it will not be restored to a pond. A Floodplain Study has been performed and indicates the pond is not be needed in the final condition. The location of Incinerator Lane will not be impacted. The reports documenting the detailed design of the stormwater, drainage, and sediment control elements are included in **Attachment H**.

4.14 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Stormwater management is necessary to mitigate the effects of development on the receiving stream system. A stormwater management design must ensure mitigation through practices described in the *2000 Maryland Stormwater Design Manual* as amended and with Montgomery County design requirements based on Chapter 19 of the Montgomery County Code.

A Stormwater Concept Report was initially submitted to DPS in May 2019 and after two review and comment cycles was approved on March 10, 2020. DPS noted that “the proposed grading associated with the capping of the existing landfill is considered to be a ‘maintenance activity’ and therefore stormwater management is not required.” DPS also noted that “safe and non-erosive conveyance of stormwater runoff must be provided to all of the proposed discharge points surrounding the site.”

EA analyzed existing and proposed drainage conditions and used this information to develop a stormwater management and drainage design. The approved Stormwater Concept Report and the Stormwater Management Report documenting the design are included in **Attachment H**.

4.15 SETTLEMENT

The surface of the Landfill continues to settle as pockets of waste decompose and the waste above it ravel and shifts, adjusting to constantly changing pressures. Settlement of a waste mass like Gude Landfill cannot be predicted with typical geotechnical investigation and analysis techniques because the waste mass is heterogeneous and its properties cannot be sufficiently measured to accurately estimate the varying settlement across the Landfill. Settlement during construction may

impact the material quantities so it is critical that it is considered in developing the measurement and payment items for the construction contract.

Aerial surveys of the Landfill from 2009, 2015, and 2018 were analyzed to estimate the magnitude of settlement that has occurred at the Landfill during that time. It was estimated that ongoing settlement of the landfill is approximately 30,000 cubic yards/year. This settlement may impact the cost of construction and is considered in the design.

A Settlement Monitoring Plan is included in the Technical Specifications to require the Contractor to document the settlement of the Landfill during the closure construction and into the post-closure period. The plan provides procedures that the Contractor must follow. The plan includes the placement of settlement plates at key locations across the top of the Landfill and procedures for measuring the elevations of the plates over time. The locations were chosen to monitor potential changes to drainage patterns and potential stresses in the Landfill capping system components.

4.16 FUTURE LAND USE EVALUATION

Future land uses at the Landfill may include passive recreational facilities and renewable energy development. EA's subcontractor, Floura Teeter Landscape Architects (Floura Teeter), developed a Comparative Analysis of potential land use activities. Floura Teeter researched the allowed land use and permitting requirements which could potentially create barriers or conflicts. The results of this research were incorporated into the Comparative Analysis. The Comparative Analysis of activities includes a ranking system and focuses on passive recreational, renewable energy, and operational activities.

The future land uses were selected based on the Authority/County's goals and input from stakeholders. Floura Teeter advanced the design of the approved preliminary plan for the passive recreational land uses, selected materials, and developed details that are consistent with the Authority/County's goals and design intent for use in the preparation of a Summary Report. The Summary Report provided conceptual layout drawings, graphics, details, and preliminary construction cost estimates for the selected land use activities. The passive recreation land use design has been incorporated into the Contract Documents. The Basis of Design report prepared by Floura Teeter is included as **Attachment O**.

5. POST-CLOSURE CARE PLAN

A Post Closure Care Plan was developed to ensure the facility is maintained in compliance with COMAR 26.04.07.22 and 40 Code of Federal Regulations Subpart 258.61(a). The Post-Closure Care Plan includes LFG collection and monitoring, groundwater monitoring, required maintenance, recordkeeping, and operations activities. Maintenance and operational activities include the maintenance of security, cover system, stormwater management structures, and LFG collection system. Monitoring activities include the monitoring of the groundwater monitoring well network, LFG monitoring probe network, surface water, and an inspection plan for the Landfill cover system.

The plan also includes standard monitoring forms and associated training to assist in ensuring the appropriate records for the Landfill post-closure maintenance and monitoring are kept per COMAR 26.04.07.22. The Post-Closure Care Plan is included in **Attachment M**.

This page intentionally left blank

6. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/ REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FORMAT

6.1 CONTRACTOR PROCUREMENT

The Authority and County are considering a two-step procurement process that will include selection of a short-list of contractors based on qualifications, experience, and similar factors. Those selected contractors will be requested to provide a price proposal to perform the remediation as defined in the Contract Documents.

6.2 PRICE PROPOSAL ITEMS

A list of price proposal items has been developed and they are described in the Measurement and Payment specification.

This page intentionally left blank

7. ANTICIPATED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

An estimated construction schedule has been developed and will be revised as the design progresses. The schedule is intended to provide an overall estimate of the construction duration. Actual detailed workflows may vary from this generalized schedule and actual production rates will vary based on the resources the Contractor applies to the project. The schedule is based on preliminary construction phasing that will be discussed and refined during the design process. The schedule does not explicitly show winter shutdown periods, but some work will be difficult during winter months and shutdowns should be considered in future discussions regarding contracting.

The schedule is based on experience with similar projects and production rates have been assumed for major schedule items. Major schedule assumptions include:

- Installing erosion and sediment controls will require 2 days per acre of each phase;
- Clearing and grubbing will require 1 day per acre of each phase;
- Subgrade preparation, waste relocation, and LFG adjustments will require 1 day per 1,500 cubic yards of waste cut/fill plus 1 day per acre of each phase;
- Temporary vegetative stabilization will require 1 day per 2 acres of each phase; and
- Closure cap construction with LFG system and access roads will require 5 days per acre of each phase.

The schedule anticipates that the Contractor will proactively and aggressively schedule tasks to minimize idle time and move smoothly from one phase to another in accordance with the grading unit requirements.

The schedule assumes weather impacts will be average for Montgomery County. No contingency for force majeure events or change orders is included in the schedule.

The construction schedule is included in **Attachment N**.

This page intentionally left blank





8. REFERENCES

- ATEC Associates. 1988. Well Construction Logs for Groundwater Monitoring Wells at Gude Landfill.
- EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc. (EA). 2010. *Gude Landfill Nature and Extent Study Report*. November.
- EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc. (EA). 2011. *Gude Landfill, Nature and Extent Study Report Amendment No. 1*. November.
- EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc. (EA). 2016. *Gude Landfill Assessment of Corrective Measures*. April.
- Maryland Geological Survey. 1968. *Geologic Map of Maryland, Montgomery County, Maryland*.
- Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and Montgomery County. 2013. Consent Order (Gude Landfill). MDE Case Number CO-11-SW-036. 28 May.
- Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). 2011. *2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control*.
- Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Water Management Administration. 2000. *Maryland Stormwater Design Manual Volumes I and II*.
- Montgomery County Code. Chapter 19. Article II. *Stormwater Management*.
- Trapp, H. and M.A. Horn. 1997. *Groundwater Atlas of the United States*. U.S. Geological Survey.

This page intentionally left blank


Figures

This page intentionally left blank

GRADE ANALYSIS			
COLOR	MINIMUM SLOPE	MAXIMUM SLOPE	AREA (SQ. FT.)
	0.00%	1.00%	452,444.30
	1.00%	2.00%	901,908.57
	2.00%	3.00%	1,089,639.92
	3.00%	4.00%	1,058,396.50

GENERAL NOTES

1. HORIZONTAL DATUM: MARYLAND STATE PLANE NAD 83
2. VERTICAL DATUM: NAVD 88, U.S. SURVEY FEET
3. PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND OWNER INFORMATION ARE BASED ON A DRAWING ENTITLED "GUDE LANDFILL - PROPERTY EXCHANGE WITH M-NCPPC" PREPARED BY C.C. JOHNSON & MALHOTRA, P.C., DATED 05/23/2012.
4. TOPOGRAPHY AND EXISTING CONDITIONS ARE BASED ON AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY AND PHOTOGRAMMETRIC MAPPING WITH SUPPLEMENTAL FIELD SURVEYED INFORMATION AND WERE PROVIDED BY WALLACE MONTGOMERY AND ASSOCIATES, JULY 2018.



FILE PATH: Q:\PROJECTS\1564601 - GUDE LF DESIGN\CAD\PRODUCTION\FIGURES\1564601 - FIGURE 1.DWG [01] 11/6/18



EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
 Hunt Valley Center
 225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
 Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
 (410) 584-7000

PROJECT NUMBER:
1564601

DATE:
JANUARY 2020

DESIGNED BY:
KEF / SMB

CHECKED BY:
LJO

DRAWN BY:
SMB

PROJECT MGR.:
MJG

FIGURE:
1

SHEET NUMBER:
-



GUDE LANDFILL REMEDIATION DESIGN
NORTHEAST MARYLAND WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY
BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

FIGURE 1: EXISTING GRADES ANALYSIS

GRADE ANALYSIS			
COLOR	MINIMUM SLOPE	MAXIMUM SLOPE	AREA (SQ. FT.)
Magenta	0.00%	1.00%	89,479.51
Red	1.00%	2.00%	240,822.88
Yellow	2.00%	3.00%	668,044.35
Green	3.00%	4.00%	549,187.32

GENERAL NOTES

1. HORIZONTAL DATUM: MARYLAND STATE PLANE NAD 83
2. VERTICAL DATUM: NAVD 88, U.S. SURVEY FEET
3. PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND OWNER INFORMATION ARE BASED ON A DRAWING ENTITLED "GUDE LANDFILL - PROPERTY EXCHANGE WITH M-NCPPC" PREPARED BY C.C. JOHNSON & MALHOTRA, P.C., DATED 05/23/2012.
4. TOPOGRAPHY AND EXISTING CONDITIONS ARE BASED ON AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY AND PHOTOGRAMMETRIC MAPPING WITH SUPPLEMENTAL FIELD SURVEYED INFORMATION AND WERE PROVIDED BY WALLACE MONTGOMERY AND ASSOCIATES, JULY 2018.




FILE PATH: Q:\PROJECTS\1564601 - GUDE LF DESIGN\CAD\PRODUCTION\FIGURES\1564601 - FIGURE 2.DWG [02] 11/6/18

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
 Hunt Valley Center
 225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
 Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
 (410) 584-7000

PROJECT NUMBER: 1564601	DESIGNED BY: KEF / SMB	DRAWN BY: SMB	FIGURE: 2
DATE: JULY 2020	CHECKED BY: LJO	PROJECT MGR.: MJG	SHEET NUMBER: -

GUDE LANDFILL REMEDIATION DESIGN
NORTHEAST MARYLAND WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY
BASIS OF DESIGN REPORT
 MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

FIGURE 2: PROPOSED GRADES ANALYSIS



NOTE:
 RADIUS OF INFLUENCE FOR INDIVIDUAL WELL VARIES FROM 142 FT TO 561 FT. HOWEVER, A CONSERVATIVE RADIUS OF INFLUENCE OF 150 FT IS SHOWN FOR ALL EXTRACTION WELLS.



GUDE LANDFILL REMEDIATION DESIGN
 NORTHEAST MARYLAND WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND


FIGURE 4: LANDFILL GAS RADIUS OF INFLUENCE


EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc., PBC
 Hunt Valley Center
 225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
 Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
 (410) 584-7000

DATE: JULY 2020
 PROJECT NUMBER: 1564601

FILE PATH: G:\PROJECTS\1564601 - GUDE LF LANDFILL REMEDIATION\FIGURES\1564601 - FIGURE 4 - LCO DESIGN\FIGURE 4 - GUDLAND - SHOWN WITH 150 FT RADIUS

FILE PATH: G:\PROJECTS\164601 - GUELFY BIODIGESTION\DRAWING\FIGURE 6\LANDFILL GAS COLLECTION SYSTEM\FIGURE 6 CD-X.dwg (DATE: 07/20/2020 10:00:00 AM)



GUELFY LANDFILL REMEDIATION DESIGN
NORTHEAST MARYLAND WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

FIGURE 6: POTENTIAL DRY LOCATIONS IN LANDFILL GAS COLLECTION SYSTEM

EA
EA Engineering, Science,
and Technology, Inc., PBC
Hunt Valley Center
225 Schilling Circle, Suite 400
Hunt Valley, Maryland 21031
(410) 584-7000

DATE: JULY 2020
PROJECT NUMBER: 1564601

FIGURE 6
SHEET: 1 OF 1

