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Executive Summary

The Saufley Field Road C&D Landfill Closure and Stormwater Improvements Project is a unique project because it involved the design, permitting and public involvement services necessary to construct a new closure system that has never been permitted or constructed in the State of Florida. Closure Turf was chosen as the closure system and it consists of utilizing 12” fill, 50 mil LLDPE Liner, layer of synthetic turf and sand ballast infill. The Closure Turf closure system was chosen because it would provide the stability, aesthetics, environmental protection and reduced operation and maintenance costs that were necessary for this facility based on the existing site conditions and the public involvement meetings with all stakeholders. The project took approximately five (5) years to design, permit and construct and it successfully improved the water quality, air quality and public health for the Escambia County residents living around the facility.
I. Design and Construction

The remedial action for the facility summarizes as follows. Approximately, 150,000 CY of C&D debris was removed from the facility to lower the site grades. The facility was regraded to provide stabilized 3:1 side slopes and also incorporate a stormwater conveyance system to the newly constructed stormwater pond. A 4.5 acre stormwater pond was constructed to provide stormwater treatment and detention for the runoff generated by the facility. A new geosynthetic closure system, Closure Turf, was utilized for this facility to control landfill gas, maintain stormwater control, minimize groundwater infiltration, control side slope seeps and reduce operation and maintenance costs during the long term care period. A passive landfill gas collection system with provisions to be converted to an active landfill gas collection system was installed as a safety measure to address any landfill gas migration or odor issues that may develop once the closure project was completed.

The site consists of a 23 acre Construction and Demolition debris landfill that was abandoned by its previous owners in 2008. Prior to the abandonment of the facility there were many compliance issues with this facility. The facility at one point was approximately 40 feet higher than the permitted design height. There were numerous odor complaints and respiratory problems associated with Hydrogen Sulfide emissions, as well as smoke and air pollution that were caused by this facility prior to its closure. The existing closure/stormwater system was allowing both sediment and leachate to be released from the facility and be discharged into the neighboring stormwater systems maintained and operated by Escambia County. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has historical records that detail the non-compliance issues seen at this facility since it was permitted in 1990. A detailed breakdown of the compliance history is located on Pages 16-18 of this document.

The site’s primary contaminants of concern consisted of Hydrogen Sulfide, offsite runoff/sedimentation, leachate seeps, particulate matter and groundwater contamination associated with elevated levels of Iron, Aluminum, Arsenic and Manganese. The air pollution associated with the operation of this facility became so extreme in 2007 that the Florida Department of Health issued a report declaring a Public Health Warning the public with regards to the elevated levels of Hydrogen Sulfide around the facility. Once the private owner abandoned the facility it was apparent that the ongoing odor and sediment runoff issues associated with this facility were not going to subside without the implementation of a formal closure plan that was tailored for the facility. The existing Financial Assurance Cost Estimate (FACE) for the facility provided for approximately $380,000.00 of funds for closure and long term care of the facility in accordance with the FDEP approved Closure Plan for the facility. The previous owner of the facility had provided the financial assurance...
through a 3rd party insurance underwriter and they would not honor the policy since the site had not been operated or closed in accordance with the permitted Closure Plan for the facility. FDEP had not been able to collect the $700,000.00 of fines and violations accrued against the owner of the facility and consequently they did not have the financial means at this point to close the facility in accordance with the original permit drawings. Escambia County recognized the need to protect the environment and health of the citizens so they entered into a Prospective Purchaser Agreement with FDEP to close the facility. Under the agreement the County would take ownership of the property to close the facility in accordance with FDEP regulatory criteria.

The remedy for the facility was chosen to be an exposed geomembrane system, Closure Turf that was covered by a synthetic turf material and ballasted with sand. This type of closure system had never been permitted in Florida or constructed in a coastal area prone to hurricanes. The County chose this type of system over the conventional two (2) feet of cover required by FDEP to reduce the possibility of concerns regarding odor, erosion, exposure of waste and continual maintenance issues associated with conventional soil closure systems.

The design challenges and considerations for environmental protection included many items of interest and involved many stakeholders. The project required that several critical path items be addressed before the design of the facility could be finalized and bid out for construction purposes. The critical path items list as follows:

1. **Permitting**: Since this project was the first of its kind in the State of Florida, the proposed Closure Turf Closure System was not an approved closure system and an alternative procedure had to be reviewed and approved through the FDEP. Jones Edmunds and Associates (JEA) were tasked with this item and the alternative procedure was successfully acquired in 2012.

2. **Property Acquisition for Stormwater Treatment System**: The proposed closure system required that a new stormwater treatment system be permitted in accordance with the Northwest Florida Water Management Districts (NWFWMD) Environmental Resource Protection (ERP) Standards. The existing facility did not have enough area available to accommodate the new stormwater system. SIGMA was tasked with evaluating adjacent properties to determine the optimum choice for property acquisition. SIGMA then contacted each of the property owners to determine which parcels were available for acquisition by the County. After an exhaustive search SIGMA recommended purchasing the 5 acre parcel on the east side of the facility. The purchase of this property allowed the project to maintain a natural privacy buffer between the project site and an
existing residential subdivision and it also allowed us to oversize the retention pond to accommodate future drainage improvement projects in this area.

3. **C&D Waste Disposal Locations** : The determination of suitable waste locations was a publically sensitive subject that was scrutinized during the public involvement phase of the project. The facility was permitted as a Construction and Demolition Debris facility through FDEP and Escambia County and a strong interest was shown by neighboring C&D facilities to be considered as suitable disposal locations for the waste material to be removed during construction. The public involvement meetings revealed that neighboring residents were concerned about hazardous and municipal solid wastes that were allegedly disposed of in this facility post Hurricane Ivan.

![FDEP Inspection Photograph – March 2006](image)

The only documented evidence of un-permitted waste was encountered by FDEP and an example of this can be seen in the photo listed above. The aforementioned items and Escambia County’s commitment to protect the health and safety of the citizens ultimately lead to the decision that waste disposal would have to occur at a Permitted Class I Subtitle D facility. A portion of the waste disposal would occur at Escambia County’s Perdido Landfill and the remainder would occur at another Permitted Class I Subtitle D Facility.
4. *Waste Disposal Options at Perdido Landfill:* SIGMA was tasked with developing grading plans that would account for the waste that would be relocated from Saufley Field Road C&D Landfill. The final grading plan that was developed involved the placement of the waste in an area where differential settling had occurred and the side slopes had subsided from a 3:1 side slope to slopes ranging from 4:1 to 6:1. The grading plan required that sixteen (16) gas wells and two (2) leachate knockouts be extended to accommodate the new grading plan.

5. *Environmental, Health and Safety during Construction:* The public outcry for the protection of the public health and safety during construction required us to develop technical specifications that were specific to this issue. The contractor was required to have onsite gas monitors, HAZWOPR trained staff, subconsultants on standby for hazardous waste disposal and weekly safety meetings to ensure that the health and safety were paramount during the construction of the closure system. Specific protocol in the technical specifications was included to address fires, hazardous waste, asbestos, odors, dust control, stormwater runoff and leachate control.

6. *Closure Turf Warranty:* Both FDEP and the County wanted reassurance that if the untested materials utilized with the closure system failed then the manufacturer would guarantee complete repair or replacement of the failing system. As a result of this, the backing of the guarantee was thoroughly researched and a detailed contract carefully defining the terms of the guarantee was developed. Jones Edmunds and Associates (JEA) were responsible for the research and development that was utilized to develop the guarantee/warranty that is currently in place for the Closure Turf System.

*Construction costs correlated closely to the predicted costs for the project.* The original solicitation had a base bid and several alternate options to dispose of varying amounts of waste. The intent of the bid solicitation was to maximize the amount of waste to be removed and the best way to achieve this was with a base bid and alternate options. Once the bids were reviewed it was determined that the apparent low bidder was approximately 10% over the construction cost estimate of $6,000,000.00 SIGMA revised the site grading plan to reduce the waste disposal quantities to remain within the budget limits for the project.
II. Operation and Maintenance

*Sustainability was incorporated into the design of the facility* by the utilization of the Closure Turf product. The use of this type of geosynthetic closure system allowed us to minimize or virtually eliminate the following types of typical maintenance issues that deplete resources and require manpower to address seen during the long term care period for a closed facility.

1. Grass Cutting/Maintenance
2. Erosion
3. Side Slope Seepage

The reduction of these items has seen on average a cost savings of $14,000/acre based upon data provided by AGRU. A typical post closure comparison of costs between a conventional soil cap and the Closure Turf System is seen below.

![Post-Closure Savings Comparison Table]

Operation and Maintenance is user friendly for this facility for several reasons. The intent of the design for this facility was to develop a closure system that did not require the continual maintenance that is seen with a conventional soil closure system. The Closure Turf System
itself only requires that the sand infill be inspected quarterly and if a major storm event occurs a portion of the sand infill may need to be replaced. To-Date only one sand replacement event has occurred at Saufley Field Road C&D Landfill and the total amount of sand that was required totaled approximately 15 cubic yards. It should be noted that this replacement event was a result of a storm event that was equivalent to approximately 6 in/hr storm which is well above the 4 inches/hr storm event that is the recommended maximum design storm event for this type of system.

*Performance and progress for the Closure Turf System are monitored* by inspecting the site quarterly and checking the following items for conformance with design specifications:

1. Sand Infill Depth
2. Hydroturf on Stormwater Downchutes
3. Differential Settling

The aforementioned items are visually observed and/or measured for conformance and then a report documenting these findings is prepared for filing purposes.

*Operation, Maintenance and Monitoring costs to date have been consistent with predicted costs.* The facility has been closed for one (1) year and we have only had one instance where it was necessary to mobilize a construction crew to replace the sand infill material due to a rain event.

**III. Stakeholders Communication and Acceptance**

*The communication process with the stakeholders required close coordination between Escambia County, FDEP and the Neighboring residents that would be affected by this project.* The coordination of this project took approximately three (3) years to complete. The coordination was necessary to get all stakeholders involved in the project and to make sure that they all had a voice in the decision making process that led up the construction and completion of the project.

*The public relations portion of this project* was critical to the overall success of the project. The neighboring residents had endured several years of odors, fire, smoke and feelings of helplessness and we recognized the importance of getting them involved early on in the project development. SIGMA held a total of three (3) public involvement meetings and these were attended by Escambia County, FDEP and the neighboring residents. The meetings were held with an open forum format and the residents were allowed to voice their concerns and/or thoughts relative to the project. SIGMA noted all of the questions and concerns and these were evaluated to determine if they could be addressed during the design phase of the project.

*The stakeholders had concerns with regards to the following issues associated with the project.* The following items and their respective resolutions list as follows:
Stakeholders Concerns

1. Waste Relocation Disposal Sites
   As mentioned earlier for the protection of human health and safety, it was determined that the best place to dispose of the waste would be at a Permitted Subtitle D Class I MSW Disposal Facility.

2. Dust Control
   The technical specifications for the project were developed to include special provisions for the utilization of a water truck to manage airborne dust during the course of construction.

3. Fire Control
   The history of fires at this facility led us to include special provisions that required a minimum of 600 CY of fill material be on stand-by at all times to address any hotspots/fires that may have developed during the construction phase of the project.

4. Hazardous Material Removal/Handling
   The history of disposing of unpermitted items at the facility led us to include special provisions for the contractor to provide licensed/certified hazardous waste removal services, if necessary, for the duration of the project.

5. Asbestos Removal/Handling
   The history of disposing of unpermitted items at the facility led us to include special provisions for the contractor to provide licensed/certified asbestos removal services, if necessary, for the duration of the project.

6. Haul Route for Trucks
   The residential areas located around the facility required us to specify haul routes that minimized the intermingling of the construction traffic with residential traffic in subdivisions and surrounding neighborhoods. Specific haul routes were developed during the design phase to address these concerns and they were incorporated into the technical specifications for the project.

7. Odor Control
   The history of odor control issues for the site required us to mandate that 6” of daily cover be maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the project and this was incorporated into the technical specifications for the project.
8. **Hydrogen Sulfide Emissions**

   The history of the hydrogen sulfide emissions with the facility required us to design a passive gas collection system that had the ability to be upgraded to an active gas collection system. The active gas system will only be employed if odor control, hydrogen sulfide emissions and offsite gas migrations prove to be an issue for the project during the long term care and monitoring phase of the project.

9. **Sediment Control**

   The history of continual offsite sediment deposition, side slope erosions/failures and leachate seeps were a major factor in the decision that led up to us choosing the Closure Turf geosynthetic closure system for the facility. The County’s commitment to protecting the citizens and the environment could be met with this type of closure system and it would also result in lower Operation and Maintenance Costs typically associated with a soil cap closure system.

10. **Aesthetics**

    The public outcry for a visually appealing closure system was evident early on in the public involvement phase of the project. Early on, the public wanted to remove all of the existing waste located above the existing grades around the facility. SIGMA looked at the costs associated with this type of waste removal/relocation effort and it was determined that over 1,000,000 cubic yards of waste would have to removed for this to occur. The $6,000,000 budgeted for the project would not allow us to attain this goal, but our design was developed in a way to minimize site height adjacent to the main thoroughfare Saufley Field Road, a natural privacy buffer was left in place between the east border of the facility and Barefoot Estates Subdivision, an 8 foot tall chainlink fence with privacy slats was installed around the perimeter of the facility and the green synthetic turf covering the entire facility provides the appearance of a freshly cut grassed facility 365 days/year.

    The stakeholders involved with this project have all been pleased with the overall performance of the Closure Turf System since the completion of the construction in March 2013. Escambia County had a press conference and onsite meeting on May 6, 2013 when the project was 90% complete to give the state and local regulatory officials an opportunity to tour the facility and see the different phases of construction that were underway. The event was videotaped and a copy of this can be seen at “The Robertson Report–Saufley Landfill Update”

    [https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=wilson+robertson+report+saulfey](https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=wilson+robertson+report+saulfey)

    FDEP officials from their main office in Tallahassee and several consultants from various locations throughout the Southeast visited the facility at this time to see the construction of the new innovative closure system. Overall all parties present at this event were impressed with the looks and overall performance of the Closure Turf system and this event gave everyone the opportunity to see how the new innovative closure system was constructed.
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FDEP officials inspected the Saufley facility for the duration of the construction of the closure system for Saufley and SIGMA was responsible for maintaining fulltime onsite Construction Quality Assurance (CQA) Services during this time as well. SIGMA worked very closely with FDEP during the permitting, design and engineering phases of this project and overall FDEP was very impressed with the engineering and construction management/observation that was utilized to construct the facility that is in place today. FDEP’s official acceptance and certification letter is found on Page 20 of this document.

**Neighboring residents** are satisfied with the construction of the closure system at Saufley. The closure system has successfully stopped offsite sediment runoff, leachate seeps, side slope erosion, reduced the overall height of the facility and minimized odors generated by the facility. SIGMA took neighboring residents on several tours of the facility during the construction phase of the facility and they were all pleased that a solution was planned and implemented to stop the issues that they had been plagued with for years when the facility was in operation under its previous private owner.

**Public interest** for the facility is evident by the recent visit to the site by a public official from the State of New Jersey. Public officials have also been in contact with FDEP to discuss the facility from a regulatory perspective. Fennimore Landfill a facility located in Roxbury Township has the same odor, smoke and fire issues that Saufley landfill had prior to the closure of the facility. In a statement made by Governor Chris Christie the Saufley Field Road C&D Landfill project was referenced as an example of how waste from an abandoned and unclosed facility can be removed and disposed of at a lined Subtitle D MSW landfill. The full article is attached for review on page 15.

**IV. Innovation and Creativity**

*The remedial action for this project had several unique and innovative aspects* that have not been seen on similar projects in the State of Florida. These aspects with their descriptions list as follows:

1. The Closure Turf system has not been permitted or constructed for any other C&D or MSW Disposal facility in the State of Florida. This is truly the first of its kind for the State of Florida. The Closure Turf System consists of 18” of intermediate soil cover, 50 Mil SuperGripnet LLDPE Liner Material, a layer of HDPE grass and ½” to ¾” of sand ballast infill material. A typical section comparing this system to a conventional soil cap can be seen below.
The introduction of this new type of closure system, successfully permitting it with FDEP and constructing it with new construction techniques truly make this a unique and innovative project that all stakeholders should be proud of.

2. Escambia County for the protection of the health and safety of its citizens voluntarily took ownership of the abandoned facility from FDEP and utilized $6,000,000 of Local Options Sales Tax (LOST) funds to close the facility in accordance with local and state regulatory criteria. Historically, projects similar in nature to this one would never be officially closed and remain an eyesore and detriment to the neighboring residents and communities surrounding these facilities.

3. Escambia County’s Department of Solid Waste also for the protection of the health and safety of its citizens accepted the waste from Saufley without charging a tip fee for the waste disposal. The waste was utilized to re-establish the 3:1 side slopes on a closed portion of the facility and it resulted in the recapturing of 80,000 cubic yards of airspace for the future waste disposal activities that will occur when the facility is expanded vertically.

4. The Operation and Maintenance associated with the Closure Turf System is unique because it requires minimal amounts of long term care and maintenance that you see with a conventional soil closure system. The reduction in long term care costs associated with this type of closure system is significant. A table listing the typical long term care costs seen with this type of closure system is listed below: The table shown below lists the historical Operation and Maintenance Costs for Closure Turf Sites constructed prior to Saufley.
The approach for the remedial action associated with this project is different because it involved several components that were not typical for a closure system for a construction and demolition debris facility. The different components with brief descriptions list as follows:

1. The closure system did not involve significant amounts of fill and topsoil for the areas of the project that required formal closure. The reduction in the soil cap thickness reduced the amount of natural resources that would need to be utilized for the project and it also increases that amount of airspace available for disposal by minimizing airspace that is typically wasted with a soil closure system.

2. Typically exposed geosynthetic closure (egc) systems require anchoring systems that can be placed on intervals that varying from 25’ to 100’ separation. The construction associated with these types of anchoring systems is cost prohibitive and result in a typical egc system not being a cost effective option as a closure system. The Closure Turf System utilizes sand infill as a ballast material to anchor the synthetic turf the 50 Mil SuperGripnet. The SuperGripnet material has spikes on the underside that interface with the clean fill material. The only anchor trench utilized for the turf or SuperGripnet are on the perimeter of the closure areas.

3. The final closure system can be driven on with vehicles, small utility vehicles and rubber tracked equipment as long as it only distributes 90 PSI tire pressure. In the event of an extraordinary event where earthmoving equipment or dump trucks are needed then a sand/soil road can be constructed on top of the Closure Turf System to provide access for larger equipment if necessary.
4. The closure turf system is different than other exposed geosynthetic systems because the final product looks and feels like a natural grassed facility which is completely different than the typical look of an exposed geosynthetic closure systems.

Closure Turf System vs Exposed Geosynthetic Cap
Daily Record (NJ), Feb. 27, 2014 5:07 PM

Opinion: Truck garbage out of Fenimore Landfill

We have waited a long time for Gov. Christie to publicly speak about the DEP remediation of the former Fenimore Landfill in Roxbury Township. For the past year, the governor and his administration have continually hid behind e-mails and redundant updates while property values continue to decline, odors continue to affect quality of life, and residents continue to experience health effects from toxic hydrogen sulfide gas exposure.

At the Town Hall meeting In Long Hill on Feb. 26, Gov. Christie said that trucking out the H2S generating material that the DEP allowed to be dumped in Roxbury is not an option; it will take two years or more to complete, it would result in a greater health hazard, and that all the experts he has spoken to agree with these statements.

Although the township and residents have asked, the DEP has not presented any scientific or factual proof that “trucking it out” is not feasible. The DEP promised this information, including a side-by-side comparison of remediation options, to the township over six months ago. We continue to wait and wonder on what basis these claims are being made? We also wonder what else may be hidden in the pile that the state is so afraid to unearth?

There are documented case studies that suggest trucking it out can be done in a timely, safe, and cost-effective manner. One “apples to apples” comparison to the Fenimore Landfill situation is the remediation of Saufley Field in Escambia County, Fla. This landfill, about the same size as Fenimore, was remediated by successfully and safely removing 321,000 cubic yards of H2S generating material from 23 acres in under one year. A major driving factor for the excavation was lack of a liner that would protect against future ground water contamination. Fenimore also lacks a protective liner but the DEP doesn’t seem concerned even though hundreds of residents residing nearby the site depend on well water.

Roxbury did not cause this problem. The DEP did by allowing a convicted felon to reopen Fenimore Landfill and dump C&D material, which is well known to cause the problems the township is experiencing, near a residential community on a site that should have been protected by the Highlands Act.

Roxbury residents have suffered enough and do not want to live at the mercy of an industrial facility and smoke stack that the state proposes be constructed in a residential area to attempt to mitigate the pollution. Just as the state of Florida determined with Saufley Field, this toxic material is better off being handled at existing sites that are appropriately equipped, such as the Warren County Landfill located about 20 miles away.

By trucking out the material, Roxbury would be provided a fair, cost effective, and permanent solution. Property values and quality of life would be restored with no future threats of odors, toxic gas emissions, or groundwater contamination. Also, school children would no longer be at the mercy of monitors to decide if they could go outside for recess or play sports on public fields. The potential for future problems would be gone forever, just as if this failed project had never happened.

Trucking it out is the best solution, a foolproof and permanent solution that Roxbury deserves.

Bill Morrocco

Advisor - REACT (Roxbury Environmental Action Coalition)
Saufley Landfill C&D Debris Disposal Facility Compliance History: 1990 to Present:

- August 3, 1990—General Permit to Operate a Construction and Demolition Debris Disposal Facility issued to English Brothers
- November 8, 1990: Non-Compliance Letter sent to English Brothers
- February 19, 1991: Non-Compliance Letter sent to English Brothers
- July 24, 1991—Warning Letter sent to English Brothers
- January 4, 1993—Warning Letter sent to English Brothers
- March 1, 1993—Consent Order sent to English Brothers
- April 15, 1993—Warning Letter sent to English Brothers
- January 14, 1994—Warning Letter sent to English Brothers
- March 17, 1994—Consent Order sent to English Brothers
- June 22, 1994—Warning Letter sent to English Brothers
- May 17, 1995—Denial of Use of General Permit to Operate a Construction and Demolition Debris Disposal Facility sent to English Brothers
- July 20, 1995—A General Permit to Operate a Construction and Demolition Debris Disposal Facility was issued to Ann Morton
- April 5, 1996—Non-Compliance Letter sent to Ann Morton
- August 19, 1997—Non-Compliance Letter sent to Ann Morton
- March 5, 1999—Warning Letter sent to Ann Morton
- April 10, 2000—Non-Compliance Letter sent to Ann Morton
- May 1, 2000—Ann Morton applies for a Construction and Demolition Debris Disposal Facility Permit for the Saufley Landfill
- June 2, 2000—Non-Compliance Letter sent to Ann Morton
- June 19, 2000—Saufley Landfill (On Fire)
- January 31, 2001—Warning Letter sent to Ann Morton addressing prohibited waste, fuel/lubricants improperly stored, no spotter present and scavenging
- February 26, 2001—Consent Order executed addressing Jan. 31, 2001 WL issues
- April 27, 2001—Notice of Intent to Deny Use of Permit (C&D) executed
- April 27, 2001—Warning Letter sent addressing prohibited waste
- May 18, 2001—A one-year C&D Debris Disposal Facility permit issued to Ann Morton. Purpose of one-year permit was to verify that facility could operate “in compliance” for an extended period of time (permit expiration date: May 18, 2002)
- March 18, 2002—Application received by Ann Morton for the Saufley Landfill C&D Debris Disposal Facility
- August 21, 2002—C&D Debris Disposal Facility permit issued to Ann Morton/Saufley Landfill
- November 17, 2002—Saufley Landfill is (On Fire)
- November 28, 2002—Saufley Landfill is again (On Fire) even after it appeared to be extinguished on November 19, 2002
- July 19, 2004 - Warning Letter sent to Ann Morton addressing slopes, no weekly cover and not maintaining a small working face.
- November 23, 2004 - Warning Letter sent to Ann Morton (permittee) concerning violations for not applying weekly cover and not submitting a corrective action report addressing iron, sulfate and total dissolved solids outside the ZOD.
- December 14, 2004 - Ann Morton signed for “Hand Delivered” WL after WL was unclaimed through U.S. Mail system.
- December 30, 2004 - Warning Letter sent to Ann Morton addressing violations of Specific Conditions No’s 20 and 40 of permit (Specific Condition 20 requires small working face and weekly cover, Specific Condition 40 requires corrective actions be taken concerning contaminates beyond the ZOD).
- January 31, 2005 - on or about Ann Morton sold Saufley Landfill to Louisiana Investment Group, LLC.
- February 1, 2005 - Ann Morton received “Hand Delivered” copy of Notice of Violation (NOV), Case No. 05-0094-17 that addresses applying weekly cover, maintaining a small working face and groundwater contamination beyond ZOD.
- February 4, 2005 - Louisiana Investment Group, LLC (LIG) submits application to transfer permit.
- February 9, 2005 - LIG approved as new owner of Saufley Landfill, Inc. (name of facility did not change).
- February 25, 2005 - Final Order issued to Saufley Landfill, Inc. concerning violations addressed in NOV.
- May 10, 2005 - Consent Order No.05-0681-17-SW executed between Department and Louisiana Investment Group, LLC. LIG agreed to submit a Site Assessment Report (SAR) within 270 days of effective date of Consent Order.
November 21, 2005—Follow-up inspection found facility to be “out-of-compliance” due to the facility being on fire, slopes greater than 3 to 1, height greater than elevation in approved operation plan and odor.

December 6 and December 12, 2005—Follow-up inspections found facility to be “out-of-compliance” due to open burning of solid waste, slopes greater than 3 to 1 and strong odor present.

January 4, 2006—Follow-up inspection found facility to be “out-of-compliance” due to debris disposed outside facility permitted footprint, burning of solid waste, slopes greater than 3 to 1, strong odor and height apparently higher than approved operation plan.

January 5, 2006—Escambia County Health Department issues “Health Advisory” due to venting smoke from Saufley Landfill.

January 5, 2006—Meeting held at Saufley Landfill to discuss fire and height. Attendees included representatives from Saufley Landfill, FDEP, Escambia County Code Enforcement and Escambia County Department of Health.

January 6, 2006—Received plan from Saufley Landfill addressing fire, cover, height, shredding waste and slope.

January 23, 2006—Consent Order No. 06-0045-17-SW executed requiring LIG to have fire extinguished on or before February 16, 2006, provide weekly progress reports, conduct a post fire temperature survey and shape side slopes to 3 to 1.

June 30, 2006—Department files a Complaint in Circuit Court of Escambia County.

July 4, 2006—“Large Fire” occurs at Saufley Landfill during the night and burns a large piece of equipment.

August 8, 2006—Judge Terry Terrell signs a Stipulated Order of Temporary Injunction. Injunction requires LIG to immediately cease accepting waste, reduce the waste height to 120 feet NGVD within 60 days and provide a topographic survey demonstrating the facility height is in compliance within 75 days.

August 28, 2006—“Fire” occurs at Saufley Landfill during height lowering operations.

October 23, 2006—Department file “Motion for Contempt” concerning height of facility.

November 21, 2006—Health Advisory issued by the Escambia County Health Department issued for the area around Saufley Landfill due to increased levels of Hydrogen Sulfide in the air around Saufley Landfill.

November 29, 2006—Issued a Demand Letter for Petroleum CO penalties of $8,250 and stipulated penalties of $100 per day for 224 days since due date of April 19, 2006. The total demand is for $33,650.

December 21, 2006—Judge Terry Terrell rules LIG is in “contempt of court” for not lowering the height of the landfill.


February 8, 2007—Report issued by Florida Department of Health indicates that hydrogen sulfide gas from Saufley Landfill is a public health hazard for nearby residents.

February 8, 2007—Department receives phone call from Steve Bowden (Saufley Landfill’s attorney) that high hydrogen sulfide levels have caused Saufley employees to become sick.

February 12, 2007—Florida Department of Health releases the results of a recent Air Quality Study at the Saufley Landfill. Department of Health informs public that the hydrogen sulfide levels released from Saufley are a public health hazard.

February 16, 2007—Escambia County Filed Motion to Intervene.
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Sent via e-mail to:
pjohnso@co.escambia.fl.us

Mr. Pat Johnson, Director
Escambia County Department
of Solid Waste Management
13009 Beulah Road
Cantonment, Florida 32533-8831

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Department of Environmental Protection (Department) has received the Certification of Construction Completion for Final Closure for the facility known as Sautley C&D Disposal Facility (OGC File No. 06-1157-C-17-SW; Facility Identification No. 3066) located on Sautley Field Road, Escambia County, Florida.

Based on the documents submitted and the enclosed review memo, it appears Sautley C&D was closed in accordance with Chapter 62-701, F.A.C., as applicable, and the approved Alternate Procedure SWAP 10-2.

A final certification of construction completion inspection performed on October 1, 2013, confirmed closure was complete. A copy of the inspection report is enclosed. A request to reimburse the County from the facility’s financial assurance mechanism will be submitted.

In accordance with Paragraph 13 of the Perspective Purchaser Agreement (OGC File No. 06-1157-C-17-SW) between Escambia County and the Department, the County shall conduct long-term care for five years. The date of commencement of the long term care period is October 9, 2013 (the date of this letter) and shall end on October 9, 2019. The groundwater monitoring plan and gas monitoring plan is enclosed for your convenience.

Information received by the Department is public record and is placed in OCULUS, an electronic database. Documents that have been placed in OCULUS for your facility can be viewed at the following link:

http://appprod.dep.state.fl.us/WWW_WACS/REPORTS/SW_Facility_Docs.asp?wassid=3066

If you have any questions, please contact Dawn Temple, P.E. by phone at 850-595-0644 or by e-mail at dawn.temple@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

J. Charles Harp
Program Administrator
Waste Management/Air Resources

JCH/dt/m

Enclosures: Groundwater/gas monitoring plan
Construction completion review memo
Inspection report

c: Lee Martin, P.E., FDEP Solid Waste Management, lee.martin@dep.state.fl.us
Richard Tedder, P.E., FDEP Solid Waste Management, Richard.Tedder@dep.state.fl.us
Susan Eldredge, FDEP Financial Assurance, solid.waste.financial.coordinator@dep.state.fl.us