



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

(14)

ATTACHMENT 4

Office of Business and Finance

CB# 1000, 300 South Building
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-1000

November 30, 1995

Dear Chapel Hill Resident:

As you know, the University is engaged in developing a land use plan for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm properties. Some concerns have been expressed about the old sanitary landfill and waste chemical burial site on the Horace Williams property. Attached is a fact sheet on these sites.

A meeting has been scheduled for December 11, 1995, at 7:30 p.m. in the Seminar Room of the Friday Continuing Education Center on Hwy 54, to discuss these sites and answer any questions you may have. I invite you to attend.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carolyn W. Elfland".

Carolyn W. Elfland
Associate Vice Chancellor for Business

(15)

Airport Road Waste Disposal Area and Old Sanitary Landfill

The Town of Chapel Hill operated a sanitary landfill on 35 acres generally north of the airport runway on the Horace Williams Property from the mid-1960's until 1973 when it was closed and the current Orange County Regional Landfill was opened. Garbage from the Town of Chapel Hill as well as the University is buried in this site along with about 7500 cubic feet of University chemical waste. The extent of chemical waste deposited by the Town is unknown.

When the present Eubanks Road landfill opened in 1973 the University, on recommendation of the forerunner of the present State Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources (DEHNR), created a separate waste chemical burial site. From 1973 until 1979, when commercial disposal became available, the University buried about 20,000 cubic feet of waste chemicals in a 0.28 acre site next to the old sanitary landfill.

In 1980, the University sought advice from DEHNR regarding the management of the chemical burial site. On recommendation from DEHNR, the University covered the site with clay, graded it to minimize water infiltration, and installed three monitoring wells which were subsequently sampled periodically. In 1981, both the old sanitary landfill and the waste chemical burial site were listed on the Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Registry. In 1984, sampling results from one of the monitoring wells at the waste chemical burial site showed the presence of groundwater contamination. The University notified DEHNR and installed two additional monitoring wells.

In 1984, as part of the CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act - often called Superfund) site evaluation process, DEHNR conducted a Preliminary Assessment of the waste chemical burial site and recommended it as low priority for a formal Screening Site Inspection (SSI) because it did not appear to pose a threat to public health. In 1988, the State of North Carolina established its own superfund program and both the landfill and the waste chemical burial site were registered. In 1991, DEHNR completed SSI's of both the landfill and the waste chemical burial site.

In 1993, DEHNR recommended that no further action be taken under CERCLA at the waste chemical burial site. However, DEHNR recommended that the University fence the site (which the University did) and conduct further studies to determine the extent of contamination.

In 1994, the University contracted with Geraghty & Miller, an environmental engineering firm, to conduct the additional studies of the waste chemical burial site recommended by DEHNR. Hydrogeologic studies by Geraghty & Miller (including 18 additional monitoring wells and 3 core borings) indicate that contaminated groundwater is flowing toward Crow Branch Creek. A ring of clean shallow groundwater wells has defined the horizontal extent of shallow groundwater contamination. Additional deep wells are needed to define the horizontal extent of deeper groundwater contamination.

MEMORANDUM

TO: W. Calvin Horton, Town Manager
Roger S. Waldon, Planning Director

FROM: Chris S. Berndt, Long Range Planning Coordinator

SUBJECT: Summary of December 11 Meeting on Horace Williams Old Sanitary Landfill
and Waste Chemical Burial Sites

DATE: December 12, 1995

Last night the University held a meeting regarding the old sanitary landfill and waste chemical burial sites located on the Horace Williams property. Mr. Don Willhoit, from the University's Health and Safety Office, began the evening by reviewing the background information that was provided in a November 30, 1995 letter to Chapel Hill residents regarding the two sites.

The University's consultant, Geraghty & Miller, described the features of the waste chemical burial site, including the soil types and main chemical constituents found to be related to the site. They noted that the groundwater in that area has been impacted with contaminants. Sampling results of the surface water in the area (Crow Branch Creek), however, showed no contamination downstream of the waste chemical site. Their study of water wells within a one-half mile radius of the site also showed no detectable constituents of waste site chemicals.

The consultant reviewed the possible "exposure pathways" for people in the area, due to the waste chemical burial site. Those are: 1) Groundwater, which has been impacted; 2) Surface water (Crow Branch Creek), which has no detectable contaminants; 3) Surface soil/direct contact, where there is no danger; and 4) Air/soil gas, where there is a potential for gas migration and accumulation.

The University's goals for the waste chemical burial site were to: 1) Confirm that groundwater contamination has not migrated off University property, 2) Evaluate and select methods for remediation/control of contaminated groundwater, and 3) Evaluate and select alternatives for removal or containment of buried containers/contaminated soil.

The possible "exposure pathways" for the old sanitary landfill are: 1) Groundwater, which has been impacted to a limited extent; 2) Surface water, where none was detected; 3) Surface soil/direct contact, where there is some exposed debris; and 4) Air/soil gas, where there is a potential for methane and volatile organic surface emissions.

The goals for the landfill were to: 1) Determine the extent of groundwater contamination, 2) Evaluate alternatives for remediation/restoration, and 3) Achieve future unrestricted use of the 35-acre site.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Lorie Tekiele, who attended this meeting, in the Planning Department at 968-2728.