

# Coal Ash Management

Ellen Lorscheider  
DENR DWM Solid Waste Section Chief

GEO<sup>3</sup>T<sup>2</sup> Conference Cary NC

## Overview

- How much coal ash is out there?
- Duke excavation plans
- Past structural fill rules – 15A NCAC 13B .1700
- Current CCR industrial landfill rules – 15A NCAC 13B .0500
- Status of the two mine reclamation beneficial reuse structural fill permit reviews
- Differences between a structural fill and CCR landfill as compared to CAMA and EPA rule

( 2 )

## How much ash is out there?

# 151,660,000 tons

- 108,310,000 tons in ash basins
  - 32 ash basins
  - 2,879 total acres
- 30,300,000 tons in landfills
  - 10 landfills
  - 314 total acres
- 13,050,000 tons in ash fills
  - 14 fills

Source - <http://www.duke-energy.com/pdfs/duke-energy-ash-metrics.pdf>

## Amount of Coal Ash at Duke Facilities

| Duke Facility | Ash Basins | Total Acreage | Ash Inventory (tons) | Landfills | Total Acreage | Ash Inventory (tons) | Ash Fills | Ash Inventory (tons) | Total Volume (tons) |
|---------------|------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Allen         | 2          | 301           | 11,580,000           | 1         | 24.5          | 930,000              | 3         | 1,430,000            | 13,940,000          |
| Asheville     | 2          | 78            | 3,410,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 0         | 0                    | 3,410,000           |
| Belews Creek  | 1          | 342           | 12,610,000           | 3         | 88.6          | 11,210,000           | 1         | 970,000              | 24,790,000          |
| Buck          | 3          | 134           | 5,060,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 1         | 250,000              | 5,310,000           |
| Cape Fear     | 5          | 173           | 5,670,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 0         | 0                    | 5,670,000           |
| Cliffside     | 3          | 144           | 6,540,000            | 1         | 23.3          | 620,000              | 0         | 0                    | 7,160,000           |
| Dan River     | 2          | 43            | 1,170,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 2         | 1,450,000            | 2,620,000           |
| HF Lee        | 5          | 314           | 5,910,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 1         | 60,000               | 5,970,000           |
| Marshall      | 1          | 450           | 22,270,000           | 3         | 53.5          | 7,000,000            | 2         | 5,730,000            | 35,000,000          |
| Mayo          | 1          | 144           | 6,900,000            | 1         | 31            | 0                    | 0         | 0                    | 6,900,000           |
| Riverbend     | 2          | 69            | 2,730,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 2         | 1,800,000            | 4,530,000           |
| Roxboro       | 2          | 495           | 16,440,000           | 1         | 93            | 10,540,000           | 1         | 520,000              | 27,500,000          |
| Sutton        | 2          | 137           | 6,320,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 1         | 840,000              | 7,160,000           |
| Weatherspoon  | 1          | 55            | 1,700,000            | 0         | 0             | 0                    | 0         | 0                    | 1,700,000           |

Source - <http://www.duke-energy.com/pdfs/duke-energy-ash-metrics.pdf>

## Duke Excavation Plan

All coal ash must be removed to a lined facility by 2019 at the following plants:

- **Asheville (Buncombe County)**
  - Active coal-fired plant
  - Phase 1 - Currently ash transferred to DWR structural fill at Asheville Airport
  - Phase 2 –construct on-site landfill
- **Dan River (Rockingham County)**
  - Retired coal-fired plant (converted to combined cycle turbine)
  - Phase 1 – move 1 million tons to Amelia MSW in Jetersville, VA (monofilled)
  - Phase 2 – construct on-site landfill
- **Riverbend (Gaston County)**
  - Retired coal-fired plant (no electricity production)
  - Ash to be transferred to Brickhaven and Colon structural fills
  - No option for on-site landfill
- **Sutton (New Hanover County)**
  - Retired coal-fired plant (converted to combined cycle turbine)
  - Phase 1 – 2 million tons transferred to Colon and Brickhaven structural fills
  - Phase 2 – construct on-site landfill

5

## Remaining Duke Fleet

- **Allen (Gaston County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 active landfill – 3612-INDUS-2008
- **Belews Creek (Stokes County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 inactive landfill – 8503-INDUS-1984
  - 2 active landfills – 8504-INDUS, 8505-INDUS
- **Buck (Rowan County)**
  - Retired coal-fired (converted to combined cycle)
  - No solid waste facilities
- **Cape Fear (Chatham County)**
  - Retired coal-fired (no electricity production)
  - No solid waste facilities
- **Cliffside a.k.a. Rogers (Rutherford County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 active landfill – 8106-INDUS-2009
- **HF Lee (Wayne County)**
  - Retired coal-fired (converted to combined cycle)
  - No solid waste facilities
- **Mayo (Person County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 active landfill – 7305-INDUS-2012
- **Marshall (Catawba County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 inactive landfill - 1804-INDUS-1983
  - 2 active landfills – 1809-INDUS, 1812-INDUS-2008
- **Roxboro (Person County)**
  - Active coal-fired
  - 1 active landfill – 7302-INDUS-1988
- **Weatherspoon (Robeson)**
  - Retired coal-fired (no electricity production)
  - No solid waste facilities

6

## Structural Fill Review

### Types of Structural Fills

- Regulated Structural Fills 15A NCAC 13B .1700
  - 61 in current inventory
    - 40 over 10,000 cubic yards
    - 21 under 10,000 cubic yards
  
- Pre-Regulatory Structural Fills (pre-January 4, 1994)
  - 18 in current inventory
    - 6 over 10,000 cubic yards
    - 12 under 10,000 cubic yards
  
- Structural Fills 15A NCAC 2T .1200
  - 2 existing source permits allowing CCP in structural fills > 1' depth
  - Current active project - Asheville Regional Airport

[ 7 ]

## Structural Fills in NC by County

(15A NCAC 13B .1700 )

- |                  |                   |                           |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| • Brunswick – 7  | • Halifax – 9     |                           |
| • Buncombe - 1   | • Henderson – 1   |                           |
| • Cabarrus – 1   | • Iredell – 17    |                           |
| • Catawba – 4    | • Mecklenburg – 2 |                           |
| • Columbus – 1   | • Nash – 9        | <b>Coastal Plains 41</b>  |
| • Craven – 1     | • Northampton – 1 | <b>Piedmont 36</b>        |
| • Cumberland – 6 | • Person – 3      | <b><u>Mountains 2</u></b> |
| • Duplin – 3     | • Robeson – 2     | <b>TOTAL 79</b>           |
| • Durham – 1     | • Rowan – 2       |                           |
| • Edgecombe – 1  | • Stokes – 2      |                           |
| • Forsyth – 2    | • Washington - 1  |                           |
| • Gaston – 2     |                   |                           |

[ 8 ]

### Structural Fill – with beneficial end use



[ 9 ]

### Structural Fill – without beneficial end use



[ 10 ]

## Asheville Regional Airport Structural Fill



NCDENR DWR Permit  
15A NCAC 2T .1200  
Buncombe County

### Area 1 (complete & capped)

- 18 acres
- 730,000 tons of coal ash
- Project life 2007-2009

### Area 2 (proposed)

- Phase 1 – 15.3 acres
- Phase 2 – 10 acres
- Phase 3 – 14.5 acres
- Total – 39.8 acres

### Area 3 (still in progress)

- 31 acres
- 1.3 million tons of coal ash
- Project life 2013-2015

### Area 4 (complete & capped)

- 45 acres
- 2.3 million tons of coal ash
- Project life 2010-2013

11

## Session Law 2014-122 (CAMA) Part III. SECTION 4.(b) Moratorium on Structural Fills

- The use of CCPs as structural fill is prohibited until Aug 1, 2015 unless the structural fill meets one of these conditions:
  - The fill is constructed with a base liner, leachate collection system and cap liner or groundwater monitoring system AND establishes financial assurance
  - The fill is used as base or sub-base of a concrete or asphalt paved road constructed under the authority of a public entity
- HB 157 clarifies that all three components (liner, leachate collection, groundwater monitoring) are needed and clarifies which commission is referred to within CAMA

12

# Brickhaven Mine Tract "A" Structural Fill Permit Submittal

## 1910-STRUC-2015

### Details

### Location

- **Moncure, NC (Chatham County)**
- **DMLR Mine Permit No. 19-25**
  - 301 acres
- **Proposing to place 12.5 million tons (10 million yd<sup>3</sup>) as structural fill at a rate of 1.7 million yd<sup>3</sup>/yr**
- **145 acres for the lined fill area**
  - Cell 1 – 33.9 acres
  - Cell 2 – 28.3 acres
  - Cell 3 – 30.2 acres
  - Cell 4 – 17.3 acres
  - Cell 5 – 34.8 acre
- **7.5 - 8 years to complete**



View of Phase 1 looking North



View of Phase 2 looking South

# Colon Mine Structural Fill Permit Submittal

## 5306-STRUC-2015

### Details

### Location

- **Sanford, NC (Lee County)**
- **DMRL Mine Permit No. 53-05**
  - 411 acres
- **Proposing to place 8.87 million tons (7.1 million yd<sup>3</sup>) as structural fill at a rate of 1.6 million yd<sup>3</sup>/yr**
- **118 acres for the lined fill area**
  - Cell 1 – 22.4 acres
  - Cell 2 – 15.3 acres
  - Cell 3 – 19.3 acres
  - Cell 4 – 31.9 acres
  - Cell 5 – 29.4 acres
- **5-5.5 years to complete**



View of Phase 1 looking North



View of Phase 1 looking South

### Draft Timeline for Structural Fill Permit and Mine Reclamation Permit Modification\*

\*The mine reclamation permit modification will incorporate the required erosion and sediment control measures, any additional NPDES stormwater requirements, and the renewal of existing mining permits.

**Jan 23, 2015:** Determination of completeness

**March 11, 2015:** Receipt of amended application by applicant- addresses technical issues of proposed federal rule

**March 12-18, 2015-** Review of submittal

**March 20, 2015-** Draft Structural Fill Permit ready for department review

**March 23, 2015:** Draft Structural Fill Permit & Mine Reclamation Permit Modification issued for public notice and comment

**March 23 to May 16, 2015:** 30-60 day public comment period.

**April 13 and April 16, 2015-** Public hearings on structural fill, mine permits and wetland permits

**No later than July 1 – August 1, 2015:** Within 60 days after public comment period, final permit decision on Structural Fill & Mine Reclamation Permit Modification

15

### Buffer Requirements for Structural Fills (.1700 Rules)

- 25 feet between edge of waste and property boundary
  - CAMA- 50 feet
- 100 feet between edge of waste and any source of drinking water
  - CAMA – 300 feet to dwelling or well
- 50 feet between edge of waste and bodies of surface water
- 50 feet between edge of waste and jurisdictional wetlands
- 2 feet between bottom of waste and seasonal high groundwater table
  - CAMA - 4 feet
- Cannot be located within a 100-year flood plain
  - CAMA – 50 feet of wetland unless ACOE issues permit or waiver

16



## Buffer Requirements for CCR Landfills (.0500 Rules)

- 50 feet between edge of waste and property boundary
- 500 feet between edge of waste and private dwelling or well
- 50 feet between edge of waste and rivers/streams
- 4 feet between bottom of waste and seasonal high groundwater table
  - EPA – 5 feet to uppermost aquifer
- Cannot discharge into wetlands and waters of the state
- Cannot restrict the flow of a 100-yr flood
- EPA – Not in seismic zone unless demonstration
- EPA - 200 feet from outermost damage zone of fault
- EPA – Not in unstable area unless demonstration

[ 17 ]

## CCR Landfills vs. Structural Fills in North Carolina

- Permitting
- Construction
- Operations
- Facility Inspections
- Environmental Monitoring
- Waste Management and Planning
- Complaint Investigation
- Annual Reporting

[ 18 ]

## Permitting CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- A CCR landfill is regulated under the 15A NCAC 13B .0500 rules with siting, design and operational requirements and requires a permit to construct and permit to operate.
- A structural fill is regulated under the 15A NCAC 13B .1700 rules and does not require a permit. The fill is given a notification. However, there are still siting, design, construction and operational requirements.
- CAMA – requires permit if >8000 tons/acre or 80,000 tons/project (<8000 tons/acre or 80,000 tons/project is “deemed” permitted).

[ 19 ]

## Construction CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- Construction of a CCR landfill requires a liner system, leachate collection system and closure cap system.
- Construction of a structural fill does not require a liner system or leachate collection system.
  - EPA – Structural fill >12,400 tons must demonstrate releases are comparable to products made without CCR
  - CAMA – requires liner, leachate collection, cap system if >8000 tons/acre or 80,000 tons/project
- Both CCR landfills and structural fills shall construct exterior slopes no greater than 3 to 1.

[ 20 ]

## Operations

### CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- Both a CCR landfill and structural fill shall operate:
  - to prevent surface water runoff
  - to establish dust control measures
- Each landfill sub-cell is closed and capped to prevent leachate accumulation on the liner before moving onto the next sub-cell, with precipitation diverted away from open working face.
- CCP placed in a structural fill
  - compacted 1 foot lifts (.1700 structural fill only)
    - CAMA - CCP placed uniformly and compacted, PE specifies for specific end use

[ 21 ]

## Facility Inspections

### CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- A CCR landfill is inspected annually by an Environmental Senior Specialist.
  - EPA – weekly by trained professional and annually by PE
- A structural fill does not have a defined inspection schedule. However, periodic inspections are performed.
  - CAMA requires annual inspections

[ 22 ]

## Environmental Monitoring CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- A CCR landfill is required to monitor the groundwater and surface water surrounding the landfill semi-annually for detection monitoring.
- EPA – existing CCR landfills: minimum of eight (8) independent samples from each background and downgradient GW well must be analyzed for Appendix III and IV no later than 30 months after publication
- EPA – new CCR landfills: minimum of eight (8) independent samples from each background and downgradient GW well must be analyzed for Appendix III and IV during first six (6) months of operation
- A structural fill is not required to conduct environmental monitoring. However, the fill shall be effectively maintained and operated to ensure no violations of the 15A NCAC 2L groundwater standards
  - EPA – Fill >12,400 tons must demonstrate releases are comparable to products made without CCR

23

## Waste Management & Planning CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- A CCR landfill is required to submit a waste management plan outlining the plan for waste management during the life of the landfill.
- A structural fill is not required to submit a waste management plan.

24

## Complaint Investigation CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- Complaints for both a CCR landfill and structural fill are investigated by an Environmental Senior Specialist
  - EPA – for CCR landfills, enforcement via citizen suits

[ 25 ]

## Annual Reporting CCR Landfill vs. Structural Fill

- Generators of CCRs are required to submit an annual summary of
  - Volume of CCRs produced
  - Volume of CCRs disposed in landfill
  - Volume of CCPs beneficially used in structural fill
  - Volume of CCPs used for other beneficial uses

[ 26 ]

# Typical Construction of CCR Landfill



## CCR Landfills at Duke Energy Progress Power Plants

| Permit ID           | County     | Permit Name                                      | Status             | Liner System                | Most Recent PTO Date | Next Permit Needed | Previous Landuse                              | Acres | FGD | Ash | GW Monitoring         |
|---------------------|------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---|-------|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| 1804-INDUS-1983     | Catawba    | Marshall Steam Station Dry Ash Landfill          | Closed (June 2008) | unlined                     | NA                   | NA                 | greenfield                                    | 61    |     |     | ✓                     |
| 1809-INDUS          | Catawba    | Marshall Steam Station FGD Landfill              | Active             | lined w/ LCS                | Nov 2011             | 11/21/16           | greenfield                                    | 31.9  | ✓   |     | ✓                     |
| 1812-INDUS-2008     | Catawba    | Marshall Steam Station Industrial Landfill #1    | Active             | double lined w/ LCS & LDS * | Mar 2011             | 3/7/16             | Phase 1 greenfield, Phase 2 retired ash pond  | 93.4  |     | ✓   | leak detection system |
| 3612-INDUS-2008     | Gaston     | Allen Steam Station RAB Landfill                 | Active             | double lined w/ LCS & LDS   | Dec 2010             | 12/9/14            | retired ash basin                             | 47    | ✓   | ✓   | leak detection system |
| 8106-INDUS          | Rutherford | Cliffside Steam Station                          | Active             | lined w/ LCS                | Sept 2010            | 9/7/15             | greenfield                                    | 85    | ✓   | ✓   | ✓                     |
| 8503-INDUS-1984     | Stokes     | Belews Creek Steam Station Pine Hall Rd Landfill | Closed (Dec 2007)  | unlined                     | NA                   | NA                 | greenfield                                    | 37.9  |     | ✓   | ✓                     |
| 8504-INDUS          | Stokes     | Belews Creek Steam Station Craig Rd Landfill     | Active             | lined w/ LCS                | Nov 2007             | 1/24/18            | greenfield                                    | 90    | ✓   | ✓   | ✓                     |
| 8505-INDUS          | Stokes     | Belews Creek Steam Station FGD Landfill          | Active             | lined w/ LCS                | Jan 2008             | 1/24/18            | greenfield                                    | 22.6  | ✓   |     | ✓                     |
| 7302-INDUS-1988     | Person     | Roxboro Steam Electric Plant                     | Active             | lined w/ 40mL LLDPE-GM      | July 2007            | 8/31/15            | lined landfill / unlined landfill / ash basin | 71    | ✓   | ✓   | ✓                     |
| 7302-INDUS-1988     | Person     | Roxboro Steam Electric Plant                     | Closed 2002        | unlined                     | NA                   | NA                 | unlined landfill / retired ash basin          | 113   |     | ✓   | ✓                     |
| 7305-IN2828DUS-2012 | Person     | Mayo Steam Electric Plan                         | Active             | double lined w/ LCS & LDS   | July 2014            | 7/1/19             | greenfield                                    | 104   | ✓   | ✓   | ✓                     |

\*LDS - leak detection system, LCS - leachate collection system



# Questions?

Ellen Lorscheider [ellen.lorscheider@ncdenr.gov](mailto:ellen.lorscheider@ncdenr.gov)  
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources  
Division of Waste Management  
919 707 8245

( 30 )