ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND DECISION ON THE NEED
FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

Form 1600-8 Rev. 6-90
Region or Bureau
West Central Region

Type List Designation
150.03(8)(e)5.a.

Contact Person: Barbara J. Hennings
Title: Hydrogeologist
Address: 101 S. Webster Street, PO Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921
Telephone Number:(608)264-6021

Applicant: Marathon County Solid Waste Management Board

Address: Marathon County Courthouse, Wausau, WI 54401

Title of Proposal: Marathon County Proposed Area B Landfill Expansion Feasibility Report

Location: County of Marathon
City/Town/Village of Ringle

Township, Range, Section(s) SE 1/4 of the NW 1/4 Section 23, T28N, R9E

PROJECT SUMMARY - DNR Review Information Based on:

List documents, plans, studies or memos referred to and provide a brief overview
- Marathon County Area B Landfill - Expansion Feasibility Report, Appendices, and Plan Sheets dated July 1998 and submitted by Becher-Hoppe Associates, Inc., Wausau, WI.
- Marathon County Area B Landfill 1997 Annual Report dated April 1998 and submitted by Becher-Hoppe Associates, Inc., Wausau, WI. Summary of activities and landfill performance for the year.
- Summary of the Advisory and Public Opinion Process as of Sept. 3, 1998 provided by Becher-Hoppe Associates, Inc., Wausau, WI.
- Memo from Tom Meier, WDNR, regarding wetlands and wildlife.
- Memo from Shirley M. Bargander, WDNR, regarding forest cropland.
- Memo from Biren A. Patel, WDNR, regarding potential air impacts and air monitoring.
- Memo from Alan Hauber, WDNR, regarding surface water and biological community.

- Additional Information for the Environmental Analysis, received November 11, 1998 and submitted by Becher-Hoppe Associates, Inc., Wausau, WI
- Memo from Pete Hubbard, WDNR, regarding leachate treatability

The Marathon County Solid Waste Management Board is proposing to horizontally expand the Area B municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) on land currently owned by the County in the Town of Ringle, Marathon County. The proposed additional design capacity is 870,000 yd3.. The limits of fill for the proposed expansion would be 6.5 acres. The proposed site life for the expansion is 4.2 years. The waste stream is anticipated to remain the same as for the existing Area B landfill. The preliminary design for the expansion includes a composite liner (geomembrane and 4 feet of clay) and a composite final cover (geomembrane and 2 feet of clay), leachate collection system, surface water drainage and control structures and gas extraction system.

DNR EVALUATION OF PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE (complete each item)

1. Environmental Effects and Their Significance

Discuss the short-term and long-term environmental effects of the proposed project, including secondary effects, particularly to geographically scarce resources such as historic or cultural resources, scenic and recreational resources, prime agricultural lands, threatened or endangered species or ecologically sensitive areas, and the significance of these effects. (The reversibility of an action affects the extent or degree of impact.)

The facility, as proposed by the Marathon County Solid Waste Department, will horizontally expand the Marathon County Area B landfill. The environmental effects of the proposed expansion, related facilities and activities would be minimized by the characteristics of the site that meet the Department's locational criteria and performance standards and by the design of the facility that will meet the Department's design criteria as specified in ch. NR 504, Wis. Adm. Code. The long and short-term environmental effects are predicted to be minimal, confined to the area in the immediate vicinity of the landfill and not be of regional significance.

The proposed horizontal expansion is located approximately 12 miles east of the Wausau-Schofield-Rothschild metropolitan area, between the communities of Ringle and Hatley in a rural area of wooded, hummocky topography with poorly developed drainage patterns near the western edge of the Hancock Moraine (Attachment 1). An area of approximately 8.8 acres would be disturbed as a result of the construction of the proposed waste fill area, containment berms sedimentation basin and perimeter access roads. Approximately 6.5 acres of this disturbed area would be the waste fill area. The proposed design capacity, excluding final cover, of 870,000 cubic yards combined with the existing Area B Landfill would result in a total expanded capacity of 3,378,000 cubic yards. The proposed life expectancy of 4.2 years combined with that of the existing landfill would result in a total expanded life expectancy of 16.3 years.

The existing landfill would be expected to close in December, 2005. If the proposed expansion would be approved, the landfill would be expected to close in March, 2010. The proposed final elevation of the expansion would be no greater than 1460 feet MSL.

The present wooded environment of the proposed site would be permanently altered to grass-covered open space after closure of the landfill because of the threat posed by shrub and tree roots to the integrity of the final cover of the landfill. Use of the area by flora and fauna would be disrupted during construction and permanent changes will result from the change in environment.

Surface Water and Wetlands

Local surface drainage patterns in the immediate vicinity of the proposed expansion would be altered as a result of the development of the landfill expansion. Proposed extensions of existing drainage ditches would collect surface run-on water from areas outside of the limits of fill during active operation of the landfill and surface water runoff from the entire surface of the expansion (the area inside the perimeter access road) after closure and final cover construction on the site. The sedimentation basin is designed to detain surface water to remove sediment entrained by it. Drainage conveyances and the sedimentation basin would be designed to comply with applicable parts of NR 504.09, Wis. Adm. Code. This water would be released either to a proposed sedimentation basin on the northeast corner of the proposed fill area or as overland flow to wetland W-2. The department will require this basin and other surface water runoff/run-on controls to be installed prior to any other construction for the facility, if the proposed site is approved.

Wetlands identified on the property are described in a wetland delineation and evaluation, Appendix D of the Initial Site Report(ISR) for the Area B Expansion. Appendix F of the ISR provides a watershed analysis using the Soil Conservation Service TR-55 model. The proposed expansion would occupy approximately 7% of the watershed of the wetland designated W-2 and extend no closer than 400 feet to the wetland. The TR-55 model shows no change in peak discharge to the wetland due to construction of the expansion. Wetlands designated W-1 and W-3 would not be affected by construction of the landfill because the expansion does not extend into the watershed of either. A small amount of surface water which would have flowed overland to wetland W-2 will be diverted to surface water basins which would be constructed as part of the site-wide surface water management system. Ralph J. Augustin of the Army Corps of Engineers indicated in a letter dated April 29, 1998 that the wetlands W-2 and W-3 derive water from overland flow rather than groundwater (Attachment 2). Because the proposed expansion does not affect wetlands, the proposal is in compliance with Ch. NR 103, Wis. Adm. Code.

Groundwater

The construction of the lined landfill expansion would reduce groundwater recharge in that area. However, the proposed expansion would not appreciably affect the rate of groundwater recharge of the larger vicinity around the site. It is not expected to cause a change in regional groundwater flow direction. This conclusion is based on the

significant depth to groundwater (about 70 feet) from the ground surface and on the relationship of the small size of the eliminated recharge area compared to the size of the regional recharge area and the groundwater flow system of which the proposed expansion is a part. Groundwater would be monitored by a network of monitoring wells and piezometers.

Local groundwater users obtain their water from wells constructed in the unconsolidated glacial deposits or in the underlying Precambrian crystalline bedrock. The closest drinking water well is approximately 1,200 feet from and side-gradient (with respect to groundwater flow direction) to the proposed waste limits. The closest drinking water wells downgradient from the proposed expansion are about 3,000 feet away (Attachment 3) Regulatory controls over landfill design and construction contained in chs. NR 500-538, Wis. Adm. Code, and the application of groundwater quality regulations contained in ch. NR 140, Wis. Adm. Code should prevent significant impacts to the groundwater of the area. Both of these sets of regulations are enforceable and, if violated, would initiate DNR action to seek restoration of groundwater quality to within acceptable limits. Because of all these factors, the construction and operation of the proposed landfill expansion is not expected to cause any appreciable impact to either the quantity or quality of the groundwater available for use.

Locational and performance Criteria
The proposed limits of filling would not be within 1000 feet of a navigable lake , pond, or flowage and would not be within 300 feet of a navigable stream. The proposed expansion is not located within a floodplain or within 1,000 feet of the right-of-way of any state trunk highway, interstate, or federal aid primary highway or the boundary of any public park. The location of the proposed expansion would naturally screen the fill area from roadways and nearby residences. The proposed north boundary of the limits of filling would be located in such a manner as to maintain a distance of more than 1,200 feet from the nearest water supply well. The proposed expansion would not be located within 200 feet of a fault that has had displacement in Holocene time, within a seismic impact zone or an unstable area.

No known scarce historical or cultural resources are anticipated to be affected by the development of the proposed expansion (Attachment 4) An archaeological survey resulted in no archaeological materials being recovered at the proposed site. No "endangered, threatened, or special concern species or any "State Natural Area" are known to exist on or near the proposed site (Attachment 5). The Federal Aviation Administration has determined that the proposed expansion would not pose a problem for a private airport located approximately two miles north of the proposed site (Attachment 6). Significant impacts on air quality are not anticipated. The proposed landfill design should prevent any significant off-site, sub-surface gas migration from the proposed expansion. Gas monitoring probes around the landfill would be monitored for gas migration.

Design
The proposed expansion would be constructed utilizing the same approved design as the existing Area B landfill. This type of construction would

minimize the risk of contaminant migration from the site by utilizing a base line design which includes 4 feet of compacted clay and a 60-mil HDPE flexible membrane, leachate collection system, and gas collection system. The composite final cover would consist of 6 inches of grading layer, 2 feet of compacted clay, 40-mil VLDPE flexible membrane, 12 inches of rounded drainage material, geotextile, 18 inches of root zone material, and 6 inches of topsoil with erosion control mat.

Leachate generated from the disposed waste and precipitation contacting the disposed waste would require collection and treatment at a wastewater treatment plant through the period of site operation and after closure. The collected leachate is proposed to be hauled by tanker truck to the Weyerhaeuser Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant in nearby Rothschild. Regulation and enforcement of wastewater treatment plant discharges to surface waters (NR 200 series, Wis. Adm. Code) reduce or eliminate the possibility of any impacts from improperly treated leachate. The department periodically evaluates the performance of the treatment plant and has determined that the plant has the capacity to treat the additional leachate that would be generated by the landfill expansion. The leachate generated and collected at the proposed expansion is anticipated to have characteristics similar to those of the leachate at the existing Area B landfill. Therefore, the leachate should not require pretreatment prior to discharge to an approved wastewater treatment plant. Disposal requirements may also be stipulated by the wastewater treatment facility that receives the leachate. Marathon County has indicated that it will pursue the City of Wausau Wastewater Treatment Plant as an alternative. Marathon County did not receive a response from the Rib Mountain Metropolitan Sewerage District when asked whether it was interested in receiving landfill leachate.

Landfill gas (primarily methane and carbon dioxide) would be generated during operation of the landfill and for many years after site closure. This gas would be collected by an active gas extraction system consisting of wells constructed through the final cover, horizontal collection pipes, a flare, and condensate collection. The department will be evaluating the compatibility of the gas system design with air quality standards, based on the analyses of the gas expected from the proposed expansion. Waste types are not anticipated to substantially change from those at the existing Area B landfill. Therefore, emission of hazardous air contaminants exceeding limitations for substances contained in s. NR 445.03 is not expected following closure, based on engineered controls.

Dust, Noise, Odors

Dust, machinery noise and exhaust fumes would continue to occur during construction and active operation of the landfill expansion but these effects would diminish with distance from the landfill. The nearest existing residence is more than 1,200 feet from the proposed limits of waste with the next closest residences being over 3,000 feet away. Forest occupies the land between the proposed expansion and the residences. Odors that are the result of waste decomposition in the landfill may also be noticeable periodically but would be controlled by the proposed active gas extraction system. The degree of these impacts would not only vary with distance from the landfill, would also vary with weather conditions. Wind-blown debris originating at the landfill is not

anticipated to be a problem at the proposed expansion if the same level of effort of control and periodic debris collection are implemented at the proposed expansion as takes place at the existing Area B landfill.

The number of trucks hauling waste destined for the proposed landfill expansion are not anticipated to increase merely as a result of the operation of the proposed expansion. However, the number of trucks on S.T.H. 29 may increase as a result of the possible increase in solid waste generation in the future. All roads to the waste disposal area would be paved so that dust will only be generated by the operation of the landfill. During the time that clay is hauled from the borrow source to the landfill, truck traffic will be significantly increased for a period of 30 to 40 days each during the liner and cover construction.

Social / Economic

No substantial regional change in the social/economic conditions would be expected from the construction and operation of the proposed expansion. Local economic conditions are not anticipated to change since no property ownership change or change in land use on the property is expected. The proposed expansion would be located on land owned by Marathon County which has been used for solid waste disposal since 1980. For the same reason, the Town of Ringle will not experience a loss of tax base because of the proposed project. Property values of lands immediately adjacent to the landfill may be depressed during its operation, but may recover after landfill closure. Development potential of adjacent parcels may be reduced because no new water supply wells may be constructed within 1,200 feet of a landfill without department approval.

Future options for use of this site after closure would be limited to uses that are compatible with an abandoned landfill. A portion of the Plover River Section of the Ice Age Trail exists on the Marathon County property, as does a cross-country ski loop. Marathon County intends to maintain public access to these trails and no relocation of the Ice Age Trail is anticipated.

2. Significance of Cumulative Effects.

Discuss the significance of reasonably anticipated cumulative effects on the environment (and energy usage, if applicable). Consider cumulative effects from repeated projects of the same type. Would the cumulative effects be more severe or substantially change the quality of the environment? Include other activities planned or proposed in the area that would compound effects on the environment.

The proposed Area B landfill expansion would be contiguous with the existing landfill on the eastern end, becoming Phase IV in the filling sequence. The expansion would receive the same waste stream as the existing landfill. The operation of the expansion would not be expected to cause a cumulative effect regarding factors such as noise, dust, and odors since the expansion will not begin operating until after Phase III is completed.

Exceedances of NR 140, Wis. Adm. Code, groundwater standards have occurred at the Area A landfill. However, contaminants in groundwater have decreased following implementation of remedial actions such as removal of the leachate collection basins. Area A would be down gradient from the proposed expansion, with respect to groundwater flow direction, and effects to groundwater from that landfill are distinguishable from any that might result from the operation of the Area B landfill or the proposed expansion.

At the existing Area B monitoring wells, random infrequent exceedances of NR 140 groundwater standards continue to occur. These exceedances are likely the result of naturally occurring variability of the soils through which groundwater travels rather than due to the landfill. Exemptions to the groundwater standards for thallium and antimony have been granted at wells 27 and 44A, where exceedances continue to be recorded, but alternative concentration limits have not been calculated. The design of the proposed expansion would include composite liner and cover systems and leachate and gas collection and treatment systems. Groundwater wells and gas probes would be monitored to evaluate the performance of the expansion. For these reasons, the additional effect on the groundwater quality from the proposed site is expected to be insignificant or nonexistent.

Any expansion beyond the currently proposed design capacity would be considered a new proposal and Marathon County would be required to complete the entire solid waste disposal facility approval process for such an expansion. A proposal to expand the Area B landfill beyond the current proposal is unlikely because of the proximity to wetland W-2 on the eastern end and the fact that the western portion is filled except for the small segregated ash disposal area. However, the County did include an adjacent Area C expansion in the Initial Site Inspection for the proposed Area B expansion. A decision to approve the currently proposed expansion and its design would not guarantee the approval of any additional submittals nor the feasibility of any other proposal.

In the event of the proposal of one or more additional landfills in the same area in the future, effects on the environment from the landfills, to the extent that they occur in spite of regulatory safeguards, may be cumulative or they may take place in sequence only when each landfill is actively being constructed and filled. For example during the active site life of each landfill if it is approved and constructed, truck traffic, noise and air-borne dust would occur and would be considered effects occurring in sequence. Examples of cumulative effects would be loss of certain types of floral and faunal habitat and degradation of groundwater in the unlikely event of contaminant migration from more than one landfill in an area.

3. Significance of Risk

a. Explain the significance of any unknowns which create substantial uncertainty in predicting effects on the quality of the environment. What additional studies or analysis would eliminate or reduce these unknowns?

The environmental effects of solid waste disposal facilities have been well documented by the department and in the scientific literature. They include groundwater, surface water, air contamination, and methane gas migration. The requirements and specifications for landfill siting, design, construction, operation, closure, and long-term care are defined by Chapters NR 500 through 538, Wis. Adm. Code, and have been developed to mitigate or eliminate the potential adverse environmental effects associated with solid waste disposal facilities. All new landfills developed in accordance with Chapters NR 500 through 520, Wis. Adm. Code, are expected to meet the performance standards established by these regulations. Department staff would inspect the construction of key elements of the landfill designs to insure compliance with the above codes.

The landfill expansion would be evaluated during operation and after closure for compliance with pertinent performance standards through an extensive environmental monitoring program to reduce the possibility, or the extent, of any groundwater contamination. Water from groundwater monitoring wells would be sampled and analyzed on a semi-annual basis. All surface water that contacts the waste would be collected in the leachate collection systems and treated at a licensed wastewater treatment plant, eliminating the possibility of any significant surface water contamination. Gas generated from the decomposition of the waste would be collected in the active gas collection system. As a result, the possibility of subsurface landfill gas migration would be significantly reduced. Gas monitoring probes would monitor the effectiveness of the gas collection system in controlling any subsurface gas migration from the landfill expansion. In addition, the operation of the landfill expansion would be inspected periodically by department staff to ensure compliance with operational requirements. Therefore, if the department's performance standards are met, the proposed expansion would not have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the environment.

b. Explain the environmental significance of reasonably anticipated operating problems such as malfunctions, spills, fires or other hazards (particularly those relating to health or safety). Consider reasonable detection and emergency response, and discuss the potential for these hazards.

The proposed landfill expansion would be designed and constructed to substantially reduce the amount of water entering the site, as well as to reduce the liquids and gases escaping from the site. A minimum thickness of 4 feet of clay plus a 60-ml HDPE geomembrane would line the bottom and sides of the expansion, and a final cover composed of a 2 foot clay layer together with a 40-mil VLDPE flexible geomembrane and other soil layers would cap the landfill expansion. Both would limit the amount of liquid entering, moving through, and leaving the contained waste mass. In addition, the installation of an active gas collection system would control migration of gas from the site. The emissions from the proposed active gas collection system would be required to comply with air quality standards as specified by the Bureau of Air Management and the system would be designed to meet those standards. Evaluation of the possible emissions from the proposed landfill expansion will be completed by the department prior to the issuance of the feasibility determination. While

it is unrealistic to assume that all the leachate and gas generated at a solid waste facility would be contained and collected, data collected at existing landfills with similar designs indicate that there is a very low probability of a serious failure of the proposed containment design.

The potential failures that may occur involve construction errors, equipment or materials failures. For example, these could include inadequate liner compaction, faulty leachate piping or storage systems, or improper base grade preparation. It would be unlikely that significant failures would occur due to required materials standards, construction documentation, site inspections conducted by department staff during landfill construction operation, and closure.

Small amounts of hazardous waste are likely to be inadvertently placed in the expansion and are considered when the department evaluates municipal waste disposal sites. The primary source of these wastes are individual households, which is allowed under state and federal law. Disposal of large quantities of hazardous waste is not likely to occur because of liability and department surveillance as well as separate licensing and regulatory controls imparted on facilities which produce or handle waste of this nature.

The monitoring network consists of groundwater monitoring wells and gas monitoring probes and is designed to provide data on the on-going performance of the leachate and gas collection and containment systems. If a failure of either the collection or containment systems did occur, an investigation would be made into the cause and extent of the effects of the failure. The monitoring network should provide early detection of released contaminants. The department would then utilize the information available to require implementation of an appropriate corrective action. If the contamination were severe enough to warrant stringent remediation measures, some of the options that may be considered include: additional containment, in-ground or above ground treatment of groundwater, soil vapor extraction, and source removal or isolation. The choice of one or a combination of alternatives would be made based on the contaminants involved, the extent of contamination, and the nature of the contaminated environment.

4. Significance of Precedent

Would a decision on this proposal influence future decisions or foreclose options that may additionally affect the quality of the environment? Describe any conflicts the proposal has with plans or policy of local, state or federal agencies. Explain the significance of each.
In general, granting a license for this proposed landfill expansion would preserve the option of future expansion. However, any proposal for a site expansion would be required to address the cumulative impacts of the proposal. The department would not approve an expansion where cumulative impacts to groundwater surface water, or wetlands would exceed standards or cause a significant adverse impact to these resources. Future expansion of the site would be subject to significant constraints by department locational criteria and performance standards such as those related to wetlands and private drinking water supplies.

5. Significance of Controversy Over Environmental Effects

Discuss the effects on the quality of the environment, including socio-economic effects, that are (or are likely to be) highly controversial, and summarize the controversy.
The proposed landfill expansion is apparently not controversial. The department's Waste Management Bureau has not received any calls or letters from any person or group concerned about the construction of the Area B landfill expansion. Neither the Department's Waste Management Bureau nor the West Central Region Waste Management staff have received any calls or letters from any person or group concerned about the construction of the Area B landfill expansion.

Local property owners whose land is near the landfill may be concerned about the effect of the construction of a landfill on the values of their property, particularly to the value of property with improvements such as houses. The possibility of such effects should be reduced somewhat by the distance of the proposed site from existing houses and by topographic separation from the proposed expansion.

Property owners living along the route between the clay borrow source and the expansion may be concerned about the amount of truck traffic (about 13 trucks per hour one way) during the 30 to 40 days required for construction. The effects of such truck traffic should be minimized as a result of the agreement between the County Highway Department and the County Solid Waste Management Department.

Local residents are likely concerned about groundwater quality due to a plume of contaminated groundwater which is emanating from the closed Area A landfill. However, the new landfill would be constructed with a composite clay and geomembrane liner system which is not present in the Area A landfill.

ALTERNATIVES

Briefly describe the impacts of no action and of alternatives that would decrease or eliminate adverse environmental effects. (Refer to any appropriate alternatives from the applicant or anyone else.)
The applicant has discussed several alternative to the expansion of the Area B landfill:

No action Because most of Marathon County's municipalities are without solid waste disposal facilities and because the existing area B landfill is estimated to be filled during the year 2005, this alternative is not considered feasible. This expansion will allow the County to continue to accept waste during the siting process for a proposed Area C landfill on the same property.

Enlargement, Reduction, or Modification This proposal is an expansion of an existing facility. The expansion add several years to the life of the facility while still preserving the wetland located east of the Area B landfill.

Other Facilities or Locations The landfill operated by the City of Abbotsford would be unable to accept the volume of waste generated in the rest of the County for a period of more than two weeks before it reached capacity. Marathon County's waste could be disposed at facilities outside the County but the County could not then control tipping fees. Potential long-term liability would also be of concern. In addition, both the Portage County and Lincoln County landfills are smaller than the Marathon County landfill. Superior Cranberry Creek Landfill is located in Wisconsin Rapids and waste disposal costs to individuals and communities would likely increase due to hauling distance alone. Marathon County does not consider any other site to have any advantages over the proposed site that would not be offset by disadvantages of equal or greater significance.

Other Methods The proposed landfill expansion would be one facet of the County solid waste management plan which was prepared in 1980. There is no more recent waste reduction and recycling plan prepared for Marathon County. Several private companies provide recycling services for the County and the paper processing operation adjacent to the landfill pelletizes scrap paper. Ashes from the pellets would likely be disposed in the county where they originated rather than being sent back to Marathon County for disposal. The estimated site life of the proposed expansion reflects the predicted effects of the estimated recycling/recovery rate.

SUMMARY OF ISSUE IDENTIFICATION ACTIVITIES

List agencies, citizen groups and individuals contacted regarding the project (include DNR personnel and title) and summarize public contacts, completed or proposed.

Date
Contact
Comment Summary

various dates
James D. Pardee - DNR Madison
EA Coordinator
Comments on applicant's Environmental Assessment; review of Environmental Analysis
various dates
Richard Brown - DNR Wausau
Solid Waste Investigator
Various Feasibility issues
9/2/98
Terry McKnight - DNR Rhinelander
Environmental Review Coordinator

Environmental Analysis review
9/17/98
Tom Meier - DNR Wausau

Potential effects to wetlands and/or biological community
9/17/98
Mike O'Keefe - US Army Corps of Engineers
Potential effects to wetlands.
Various dates
Dave Siebert - Wetlands Ecologlist, DNR Science Services, Madison
Wetlands issues
various dates
Tom Bernthal - Wetlands Specialist
DNR Fisheries Mgt, Madison
Wetlands issues
various dates
Jim Pelletteri, Landfill Manager
Marathon County Landfill
Various Feasibility issues
various dates
Evelyn Fisher, PE
Becher-Hoppe Associates
Various Feasibility issues
various dates
Brian Hahn, PG
Becher-Hoppe Associates
Feasibility Check-list and completeness
various dates
Eric Syftestad, PE DNR
Waste Management Engineer
Design issues
various dates
Don Grasser, PE DNR Wis. Rapids Waste Management Team Supervisor
Various Feasibility and design issues
various dates
Paul Huebner, PG DNR Madison
Hydrogeologist Supervisor
Various Feasibility issues
various dates
Jack Connelly, PG DNR Madison
Hydrogeologist Supervisor
Various groundwater issues

Deb Pingel - DNR Wausau
Solid Waste Investigator
needs

9/10/98
Biren A. Patel - DNR Wausau
Air Management Engineer
potential air impacts and recommendations for monitoring
9/10/98
Shirley Borgander - DNR Wausau
Forestry Sub-Team Leader

potential effects to forest cropland

9/10/98
Alan Hauber - DNR Wausau
Fish biologist
potential impacts to surface water, fish
11/30/98
Pete Hubbard - DNR Wausau
Wastewater Engineer
leachate treatability

On-site inspection or past experience with site by evaluator.

Project Name: Marathon County Area B Landfill Expansion County: Marathon

DECISION (This decision is not final until certified by the appropriate authority)

In accordance with s. 1.11, Stats., and Ch. NR 150, Adm. Code, the Department is authorized and required to determine whether it has complied with s. 1.11, Stats., and Ch. NR 150, Wis. Adm. Code.

Complete either A or B below:

A. EIS Process Not Required

The attached analysis of the expected impacts of this proposal is of sufficient scope and detail to conclude that this is not a major action which would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. In my opinion, therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required prior to final action by the Department on this project.

B. Major Action Requiring the Full EIS Process

The proposal is of such magnitude and complexity with such considerable and important impacts on the quality of the human environment that it constitutes a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Signature of Evaluator

Date Signed

Noted: Regional Waste Supervisor

Date Signed

Number of responses to news release or other notice:

Certified to be in compliance with WEPA
District Director or Director of Bureau of Integrated Science Services
(or Designee)

Date Signed

NOTICE OF APPEAL RIGHTS

If you believe that you have a right to challenge this decision, you should know that Wisconsin statutes and administrative rules establish time periods within which requests to review Department decisions must be filed.

For judicial review of a decision pursuant to sections 227.52 and 227.53, Stats., you have 30 days after the decision is mailed, or otherwise served by the Department, to file your petition with the appropriate circuit court and serve the petition on the Department. Such a petition for judicial review shall name the Department of Natural Resources as the respondent.

To request a contested case hearing pursuant to section 227.42, Stats., you have 30 days after the decision is mailed, or otherwise served by the Department, to serve a petition for hearing on the Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources. The filing of a request for a contested case hearing is not a prerequisite for judicial review and does not extend the 30-day period for filing a petition for judicial review.

Note: Not all Department decisions respecting environmental impact, such as those involving solid waste or hazardous waste facilities under sections 144.43 to 144.47 and 144.60 to 144.74, Stats., are subject to the contested case hearing provisions of section 227.42, Stats.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 227.48(2), Stats.
??

Project Name: Marathon County Area B Landfill Expansion County: Marathon

DECISION (This decision is not final until certified by the appropriate authority)

In accordance with s. 1.11, Stats., and Ch. NR 150, Adm. Code, the Department is authorized and required to determine whether it has complied with s. 1.11, Stats., and Ch. NR 150, Wis. Adm. Code.

Complete either A or B below:

A. EIS Process Not Required ☒

The attached analysis of the expected impacts of this proposal is of sufficient scope and detail to conclude that this is not a major action which would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. In my opinion, therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required prior to final action by the Department on this project.

B. Major Action Requiring the Full EIS Process ☐

The proposal is of such magnitude and complexity with such considerable and important impacts on the quality of the human environment that it constitutes a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Signature of Evaluator	Date Signed
Barbara J. Hennings	1-20-99
Noted: Regional Waste Supervisor Donald R. Grasser	Date Signed 1-20-99

Number of responses to news release or other notice: 0

Certified to be in compliance with WEPA	
District Director or Director of Bureau of Integrated Science Services (or Designee) James D. Pardee	Date Signed 3/17/99

NOTICE OF APPEAL RIGHTS

If you believe that you have a right to challenge this decision, you should know that Wisconsin statutes and administrative rules establish time periods within which requests to review Department decisions must be filed.

For judicial review of a decision pursuant to sections 227.52 and 227.53, Stats., you have 30 days after the decision is mailed, or otherwise served by the Department, to file your petition with the appropriate circuit court and serve the petition on the Department. Such a petition for judicial review shall name the Department of Natural Resources as the respondent.

To request a contested case hearing pursuant to section 227.42, Stats., you have 30 days after the decision is mailed, or otherwise served by the Department, to serve a petition for hearing on the Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources. The filing of a request for a contested case hearing is not a prerequisite for judicial review and does not extend the 30-day period for filing a petition for judicial review.

Note: Not all Department decisions respecting environmental impact, such as those involving solid waste or hazardous waste facilities under sections 144.43 to 144.47 and 144.60 to 144.74, Stats., are subject to the contested case hearing provisions of section 227.42, Stats.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 227.48(2), Stats.