



Evaluating Cover Systems for Solid and Hazardous Waste

EVALUATING COVER SYSTEMS FOR SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

by

R. J. Lutton

U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180

Interagency Agreement No. EPA-IAG-D7-01097

Project Officer

Robert E. Landreth

Solid and Hazardous Waste Research Division
Municipal Environmental Research Laboratory
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

MUNICIPAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45268

DISCLAIMER

This report has been reviewed by the Municipal Environmental Research Laboratory, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Permit Writers Guidance Manual/Technical Resource Document

Preface

The land disposal of hazardous waste is subject to the requirements of Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976. This Act requires that the treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous wastes after November 19, 1980, be carried out in accordance with a permit. The one exception to this rule is that facilities in existence as of November 19, 1980 may continue operations until final administrative disposition is made of the permit application (providing that the facility complies with the Interim Status Standards for disposers of hazardous waste in 40 CFR Part 265). Owners or operators of new facilities must apply for and receive a permit before beginning operation of such a facility.

The Interim Status Standards (40 CFR Part 265) and some of the administrative portions of the Permit Standards (40 CFR Part 264) were published by EPA in the Federal Register on May 19, 1980. EPA will soon publish technical permit standards in Part 264 for hazardous waste disposal facilities. These regulations will ensure the protection of human health and the environment by requiring evaluations of hazardous waste management facilities in terms of both site-specific factors and the nature of the waste that the facility will manage.

The permit official must review and evaluate permit applications to determine whether the proposed objectives, design, and operation of a land disposal facility will be in compliance with all applicable provisions of the regulations (40 CFR 264).

EPA is preparing two types of documents for permit officials responsible for hazardous waste landfills, surface impoundments, and land treatment facilities: Permit Writers Guidance Manuals and Technical Resource Documents. The Permit Writers Guidance Manuals provide guidance for conducting the review and evaluation of a permit application for site-specific control objectives and designs. The Technical Resource Documents support the Permit Writers Guidance Manuals in certain areas (i.e. liners, leachate management, closure, covers, water balance) by describing current technologies and methods for evaluating the performance of the applicant's design. The information and guidance presented in these manuals constitute a suggested approach for review and evaluation based on best engineering judgments. There may be alternative and equivalent methods for conducting the review and evaluation. However,

if the results of these methods differ from those of the EPA method, their validity may have to be validated by the applicant.

In reviewing and evaluating the permit application, the permit official must make all decisions in a well defined and well documented manner. Once an initial decision is made to issue or deny the permit, the Subtitle C regulations (40 CFR 124.6, 124.7 and 124.8) require preparation of either a statement of basis or a fact sheet that discusses the reasons behind the decision. The statement of basis or fact sheet then becomes part of the permit review process specified in 40 CRF 124.6-124.20.

These manuals are intended to assist the permit official in arriving at a logical, well-defined, and well-documented decision. Checklists and logic flow diagrams are provided throughout the manuals to ensure that necessary factors are considered in the decision process. Technical data are presented to enable the permit official to identify proposed designs that may require more detailed analysis because of a deviation from suggested practices. The technical data are not meant to provide rigid guidelines for arriving at a decision. References are cited throughout the manuals to provide further guidance for the permit official when necessary.

FOREWORD

The Environmental Protection Agency was created because of increasing public and governmental concern about the dangers of pollution to the health and welfare of the American people. Noxious air, foul water, and spoiled land are tragic testimony to the deterioration of our natural environment. The complexity of the environment and the interplay between its components require a concentrated and integrated attack on the problem.

Research and development is the first necessary step in problem solution; it involves defining the problem, measuring its impact, and searching for solutions. The Municipal Environmental Research Laboratory develops new and improved technology and systems to prevent, treat, and manage wastewater and the solid and hazardous waste pollutant discharges from municipal and community sources; to preserve and treat public drinking water supplies; and to minimize the adverse economic, social, health and aesthetic effects of pollution. This publication is one of the products of that research--a vital communications link between the researcher and the user community.

This report is to be used as a tool for evaluating various landfill cover systems. This data information can be used in determining cover design requirements for compliance with the current regulations.

Francis T. Mayo, Director
Municipal Environmental Research
Laboratory

ABSTRACT

A critical part of the sequence of designing, constructing, and maintaining an effective cover over solid and hazardous waste is the evaluation of engineering plans. Such evaluation is an important function of regulating agencies, and accompanying documentation can form one basis for issuing or denying a permit to the owner/operator of the waste disposal facility. This manual describes 36 steps in evaluation of plans submitted for approval. Generally, the evaluator considers available soils, site conditions, details of cover design, and post-closure maintenance and contingencies.

This report was submitted in fulfillment of Phase III of Interagency Agreement No. EPA-IAG-D7-01097 between the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES). Work for this manual was conducted during the period December 1979 to July 1980, and work was completed in July 1980. Dr. R. J. Lutton, Geotechnical Laboratory, WES, was principal investigator and author. Director of WES during the work period was COL Nelson P. Conover, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| Preface. | iii |
| Foreword | v |
| Abstract | vi |
| Metric Conversion Table | viii |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Purpose and scope | 1 |
| Procedures of evaluation | 1 |
| 2. Examination of Data | 3 |
| Test data review procedure (Steps 1-3) | 3 |
| Topographical data review procedure (Step 4) | 13 |
| Climatological data review procedure (Steps 5-7) | 16 |
| 3. Steps in Evaluation | 20 |
| Cover composition evaluation procedure (Step 8) | 20 |
| Thickness evaluation procedure (Steps 9-13) | 24 |
| Placement evaluation procedure (Steps 14-17) | 28 |
| Configuration evaluation procedure (Steps 18-19) | 36 |
| Drainage evaluation procedure (Steps 20-22) | 43 |
| Vegetation evaluation procedure (Steps 23-29) | 45 |
| 4. Post-closure Plan | 52 |
| Maintenance evaluation procedure (Steps 30-32) | 52 |
| Contingency plan evaluation procedure (Steps 33-36). | 54 |
| References | 56 |

METRIC CONVERSION TABLE

| Multiply | By | To Obtain |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| acres | 4046.856 | square meters |
| cubic feet per second | 0.02831685 | cubic meters per second |
| degrees (angle) | 0.01745329 | radians |
| feet | 0.3048 | meters |
| gallons (U. S. liquid) | 0.003785412 | cubic meters |
| inches | 0.0254 | meters |
| pounds (mass) | 0.4535924 | kilograms |
| pounds (mass) per acre | 0.1120851 | grams per square meter |
| pounds (mass) per cubic foot | 16.01846 | kilograms per cubic meter |
| square feet | 0.09290304 | square meters |
| tons (short, mass) | 907.1847 | kilograms |
| tons (mass) per acre | 0.2241702 | kilograms per square meter |

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

Growing concern for the preservation of a healthful environment, now and in the future, was the major impetus to the enactment of Public Law 94-580, "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976" (21 October 1976). An important part of solid and hazardous waste management is the regulatory control exercised by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regional offices and corresponding agencies in state governments. In turn, a major facet of this regulatory function is the evaluation of the adequacy of closure covers over the wastes.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This manual presents a procedure for evaluating closure covers proposed for solid and hazardous wastes. The manual is written principally for staff members in the Regional EPA offices and/or state offices charged with evaluating applications from owners/operators of solid and hazardous waste disposal areas. All aspects of cover are addressed in sufficient detail to allow for a complete evaluation of the entire cover system. For more details on the subjects covered in this manual, the reader is referred to a recent report emphasizing design and construction of covers which serves as the backup document.¹

PROCEDURES OF EVALUATION

The evaluation of cover characteristics and design should be kept in conformance to applicable regulations. The sequence of procedures is outlined as follows:

1. Examine soil test data
2. Examine topography
3. Examine climate data
4. Evaluate composition
5. Evaluate thickness

6. Evaluate placement
7. Evaluate configuration
8. Evaluate drainage
9. Evaluate vegetation
10. Evaluate post-closure maintenance
11. Evaluate contingencies plan

The first three procedures in the evaluation process (presented in SECTION 2) constitute a careful review of materials and conditions at the proposed or existing site under consideration. Procedures 4-9 outline evaluations of the characteristics of the cover system within the constraints offered by review procedures 1-3. Procedures 10 and 11 evaluate the adequacy of the cover system and post-closure plan for future conditions, both expected and unexpected.

Opportunity will be provided in the evaluation scheme in Section 2 for consideration of departures from more or less conventional designs. Such an option is specifically intended for instances where the owner/operator, for one reason or another, proposes a design based on a special engineering study or calculations. In evaluating such departures in design, the permitting authority will find useful the additional technical guidance in Reference 1 or may enlist an experienced consulting firm or other source of technical assistance to conduct the evaluation.

SECTION 2

EXAMINATION OF DATA

TEST DATA REVIEW PROCEDURE

Sampling and testing are intended to characterize and delineate all important soil types, and therefore should be under the direction of an experienced engineer or geologist having competence in the field of soil mechanics. Field sampling data and laboratory test results should be thorough and according to widely accepted procedures. Table 1 summarizes the tests that may be necessary.

Review Field Sampling of Soils

Step 1

The objective of Step 1* is to establish that the applicant has satisfactorily documented the physical characteristics, volume, and spatial distribution of each of the major, distinguishable soil types to be used as cover. These data, obtained from test pits or borings in the borrow area, must be accurate since the adequacy of the cover system and the feasibility of the covering operation are directly affected.

The evaluation is accomplished by examining a map of soil sampling locations along with some graphical or tabular presentation of the depths and nature of the soils at each location. Soil types collected at each location should be classified as described under Step 2. Soil type should be identified at regular depth intervals even where the soil is obviously uniform to the depth of interest. Changes in soil types should be located. Much of the delineation of soil types is accomplished on the basis of characteristics observed and used in the field, e.g. color and feel when rubbed between fingers. Such field characteristics should be explained and related to the traditional U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) soil classes based on grain size (Figures 1 and 2) where reasonable. Characterization in terms of the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) (Figure 3) is confirmed subsequently in laboratory testing (Step 2).

The owner/operator application should include a brief description of the field sampling methods besides the observations. The traditional manner of exploring soil to depths of more than a few feet is by soil boring but trenching below ground surface or cleaning an existing bluff face or pit wall

*Step 1 may be unnecessary where the plan is to contract for the required volumes of certain soil types delivered to the waste disposal site.

TABLE 1. LABORATORY TEST METHODS FOR SOIL

| Name of Test | Standard or Preferred Method* | Properties or Parameters Determined | Remarks/Special Equipment Requirements |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Index and Classification Tests | | | |
| Gradation Analysis | ASTM D421 D422 D2217 | Particle size distribution | |
| Percent Fines | ASTM D1140 | Percent of weight of material finer than No. 200 sieve | |
| Atterberg Limits | ASTM D423 D424 D427 | Plastic limit, liquid limit, plasticity index, shrinkage factors | |
| Specific Gravity | ASTM D854 | Specific gravity or apparent specific gravity of soil solids | Boiling should not be used for de-airing |
| Soil Description | ASTM D2488 | Description of soil from visual-manual examination | |
| Soil Classification | ASTM D2487 | Unified soil classification | |
| Moisture-Density Relations | | | |
| Bulk Unit Weight | Reference 3 | Bulk unit weight (bulk density) | |
| Water Content | ASTM D2216 D2974 | Water content as percent of dry weight | |
| Relative Density | Reference 3 | Maximum and minimum density of cohesionless soils | Modified test may be substituted for test with vibratory table |
| Compaction | ASTM D698 (or 5- to 15-blow modification) | Optimum water and maximum density | Method for earth and rock mixtures is given in Reference 3 |

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (continued)

| Name of Test | Standard or Preferred Method* | Properties or Parameters Determined | Remarks/Special Equipment Requirements |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Consolidation and Permeability | | | |
| Consolidation | ASTM D2435 | One-dimensional compressibility, permeability of cohesive soil | |
| Permeability | ASTM D2434 | Permeability | |
| Physical and Chemical Properties | | | |
| Mineralogy | Reference 4 | Identification of minerals | Requires X-ray diffraction apparatus. Differential thermal analysis apparatus may also be used |
| Organic Content | Reference 5 ASTM D2974 | Organic and inorganic carbon content as percent of dry weight | Where organic matter content is critical, D2974 results should be verified by wet combustion tests (Reference 5) |
| Soluble salts | Reference 6 | Concentration of soluble salts in soil pore water | |
| Pinhole Test | Reference 7 | Dispersion tendency in cohesive soils | Significant in evaluation of potential erosion or piping |
| Shear Strength and Deformability | | | |
| Unconfined Compression | ASTM D2166 | Strength of cohesive soil in uniaxial compression | |

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (continued)

| Name of Test | Standard or Preferred Method* | Properties or Parameters Determined | Remarks/Special Equipment Requirements |
|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Direct Shear, Consolidated-Drained | ASTM D3080 | Cohesion and angle of internal friction under drained conditions | |
| Triaxial Compression, Unconsolidated-Undrained | ASTM D2850 | Shear strength parameters; cohesion and angle of internal friction for soils of low permeability | |
| Triaxial Compression, Consolidated-Undrained | Reference 3 | Shear strength parameters; cohesion and angle of internal friction for consolidated soil | Circumferential drains, if used, should be slit to avoid stiffening test specimen |
| Triaxial Compression, Consolidated-Drained | Reference 3 | Shear strength parameters; cohesion and angle of internal friction, for long-term loading conditions | Circumferential drains, if used, should be slit to avoid stiffening test specimen |

* ASTM standard methods are given in Reference 2.




Figure 1. USDA textural classification chart.




Figure 2. Comparison of USCS and USDA particle-size scales.

| Major Divisions | | Group Symbols | Typical Names | Field Identification Procedures (Excluding particles larger than 3 in. and basing fractions on estimated weights) | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| Coarse-grained Soils More than half of material is larger than No. 200 sieve size. The smallest particle visible to the naked eye. | Gravels More than half of coarse fraction is larger than No. 4 sieve size. (For visual classification, the 1/4-in. size may be used as equivalent to the No. 4 sieve size) | Clean Gravels (Little or no fines) | GW | Well-graded gravels, gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines. | Wide range in grain sizes and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes. | | | |
| | | | GP | Poorly graded gravels or gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines. | Predominantly one size or a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing. | | | |
| | | | GM | Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixture. | Nonplastic fines or fines with low plasticity (for identification procedures see ML below). | | | |
| | | | GC | Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures. | Plastic fines (for identification procedures see CL below). | | | |
| | | Clean Sands (Little or no fines) | SW | Well-graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines. | Wide range in grain size and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes. | | | |
| | | | SP | Poorly graded sands or gravelly sands, little or no fines. | Predominantly one size or a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing. | | | |
| | | Sands with Fines (Appreciable amount of fines) | SM | Silty sands, sand-silt mixtures. | Nonplastic fines or fines with low plasticity (for identification procedures see ML below). | | | |
| | | | SC | Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures. | Plastic fines (for identification procedures see CL below). | | | |
| | | Fine-grained Soils More than half of material is smaller than No. 200 sieve size. The No. 200 sieve size is about the same as the size of the smallest particle visible to the naked eye. | Silt and Clays Liquid limit is less than 50 | Identification Procedures on Fraction Smaller than No. 40 Sieve Size | | | | |
| | | | | | | Dry Strength (Crushing characteristics) | Dilatancy (Reaction to shaking) | Toughness (Consistency near PL) |
| ML | Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands or clayey silts with slight plasticity. | | | None to slight | Quick to slow | None | | |
| Silt and Clays Liquid limit is greater than 50 | CL | | Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays. | Medium to high | None to very slow | Medium | | |
| | OL | | Organic silts and organic silty clays of low plasticity. | Slight to medium | Slow | Slight | | |
| | MH | | Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts. | Slight to medium | Slow to none | Slight to medium | | |
| | CH | | Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays. | High to very high | None | High | | |
| Highly Organic Soils | OH | | Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silts. | Medium to high | None to very slow | Slight to medium | | |
| | Pt | | Peat and other highly organic soils. | Readily identified by color, odor, spongy feel and frequently by fibrous texture. | | | | |

(1) Soils possessing characteristics of two groups are designated by combinations of group symbols. For example GW-GC, well-graded gravel-sand mixture with clay binder. (2) All sieve sizes on this chart are U. S. standard.

FIELD IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR FINE-GRAINED SOILS OR FRACTIONS (MINUS NO. 40 SIEVE)

Screening is not intended; simply remove by hand the coarse particles that interfere with tests.

Dilatancy (reaction to shaking). After removing particles larger than No. 40 sieve size, prepare a pat of moist soil with a volume of about one-half cubic inch. Add enough water if necessary to make the soil soft but not sticky.

Place the pat in the open palm of one hand and shake horizontally, striking vigorously against the other hand several times. A positive reaction consists of the appearance of water on the surface of the pat which changes to a livery consistency and becomes glossy. When the sample is squeezed between the fingers, the water and gloss disappear from the surface, the pat stiffens, and finally it cracks or crumbles. The rapidity of appearance of water during shaking and of its disappearance during squeezing assist in identifying the character of the fines in a soil.

Very fine clean sands give the quickest and most distinct reaction whereas a plastic clay has no reaction. Inorganic silts, such as a typical rock flour, show a moderately quick reaction.

Dry Strength (crushing characteristics). After removing particles larger than No. 40 sieve size, mold a pat of soil to the consistency of putty, adding water if necessary. Allow the pat to dry completely by oven, sun, or air-drying, and then test its

Figure 3. Summary of the USC system.

(continued)

may be as effective and less costly where on-site equipment is sufficient. Whatever the method, it should be documented in the application.

The evaluator must decide whether the arrangement and spacing of samples have been adequate to delineate the vertical and lateral extent of the major soil types. Where the evaluation indicates that sampling intervals are too large, it may be necessary to require additional samples at intermediate positions. One effective technique is to sample at fairly close spacing along a single line across the borrow area. Elsewhere in the area there may be a need for only a few additional borings to confirm that the stratification (including thicknesses) along the cross section apply elsewhere also. A grid pattern may also be definitive. The following example helps to clarify Step 1.

Example: Suppose an application presents as an inclosure the plan map in Figure 4. The sampling methods at the three locations have been reviewed and found to be satisfactory; a geological technician made depth measurements and identified and sampled the soil types. The evaluator observes that one of the three sampling locations is distinct from the other two. The evaluator therefore recommends that new sample locations be added to delineate the extent of the CL soil more confidently since this soil type is important in design of the particular cover.




Figure 4. Hypothetical cover soil source.

Check Adequacy of Soil Testing Program

Step 2

Two major aspects of the testing program that need to be evaluated are the selection of tests and the adequacy of testing facilities and personnel.

Tests that might be expected or perhaps even specified as minimum requirements for all diagnostic samples are as follows:

Grain-Size Distribution (Figure 5)

Percent Fines

Atterberg Limits

Soil Classification

Water Content




Figure 5. Gradation of a landfill cover soil.

The tests may be required in duplicate (or more) for better representation and checking. These tests are basically indexing tests but also useful for establishing the uniformity or variability within individual soil types. Other important tests are compaction (Figure 6) and permeability. Even one of these additional tests or test series may be adequate to establish characteristics of the unit as a whole provided that unit is relatively uniform in its index properties.

The remaining soil tests (Table 1) are assigned only where special problems of slope stability, consolidation, etc. are anticipated. The need for these tests may not become apparent until after most of the routine index testing has been accomplished, sometimes not until the critical review by the evaluator. Nevertheless, the lack of information from special tests may occasionally constitute a basis for delaying a permit application.




Figure 6. Standard compaction test results with landfill cover soil.¹

Example: In reviewing a permit application an evaluator finds that a county soil survey report has been used as the basis for characterizing the soil at the proposed borrow area. The applicant has used Atterberg limits, classification, and grain-size distribution data from the report for type Grenada 6 soil which has been mapped over 36 percent of the county and specifically is shown as underlying the borrow area. After careful consideration, the evaluator requests that several deep soil boring samples from the borrow area be tested at a qualified testing laboratory to verify or reject the suitability of the data from the general county report for cover design. These samples will also serve to show how well the county survey of surficial agricultural soils represents the soils at depths below a few feet which, of necessity, will contribute to total cover soil volume.

Check Soil Volumes Available

Step 3

At some stage, not necessarily when the site or borrow area is sampled and tested, the sufficiency of cover soil volume should be evaluated.

Accurate volume calculations depend upon accurate measurements of soil thicknesses and areas. Accordingly, the evaluator may recommend additional sampling locations, not only for a better fix on soil indices and properties but to allow a better calculation of the volumes. Where the data in the application have shown a uniformity of soil type, it may only be necessary to check thicknesses rather than to sample and test also. The following example illustrates the situation, but also see the example under Step 1.

Example: An applicant has submitted the information shown in Figure 7 as a basis for his estimates of volumes of soil types available for use as cover. The evaluator reasons that there is a possibility of a sizable overestimation of suitable soils available to complete the closure since variations of layer thicknesses between the existing sample locations are a distinct possibility (shown by dashed line in the figure). In this hypothetical case, the evaluator chooses to accept the estimated volumes on the basis of observations he has made in a field inspection and after consultation with a staff geologist.

An important factor in checking volumes available can be the bulking factor. Some natural soils, particularly those at depth, have a relatively high unit weight in situ. After excavation, working, and placement as cover over solid waste, these soils will have experienced a reduction in unit weight, i.e., a bulking effect, and available volumes tend to be underestimated. In contrast, other soils, particularly those near the surface, have a relatively low unit weight in situ so that available volumes are easily overestimated. The evaluator should carefully check the basis for any bulking factor where soil is in short supply.

TOPOGRAPHICAL DATA REVIEW PROCEDURE

Examine Configuration and Topography

Step 4

Next the surface configuration of the cover is examined to assure that evaluations can be made in regard to slope stability, water erosion, and wind erosion. Most engineered fills for highways, foundations, and so forth are designed on the basis of accurate topography or multiple cross sections, and the evaluator may reasonably expect some such basic data to accompany the closure plan. Otherwise, the justification for omitting such basic data should be convincingly presented in the application or be self evident.

One basic form of data presentation is with cross sections through the cover extending across the site (see Step 1). Cross sections should show thickness of the closure cover and solid waste and the limits of natural soil previously excavated for use as cover. Besides being useful for engineering design and for evaluation of the design, cross sections are potentially useful for monitoring changes in configuration that may take place as a result of settlement in the long term. Preparation of cross sections is well within the capability of most organizations engaged in construction and can reasonably be expected as a part of an application.




Figure 7. Hypothetical cover soil volume data.

A set of cross sections, often parallel to one another, can be highly useful. Ordinarily the line of section (the surface trace of the cross section) should trend downslope. Since many solid waste landfills will be completed with a somewhat irregular surface configuration approaching natural hills and swales, it may be necessary for the cross sections to be oblique to one another rather than parallel. About the only criterion for evaluating sufficiency in the number of cross sections is whether they present the important aspects of the surface form, closure cover, and underlying solid waste.

Example: Suppose that the configuration of a solid waste landfill is as shown in Figure 8. The owner/operator of the landfill is seeking permission to place final cover and move his current operations to an adjacent site. He has supplied the sketch of the site and the surveyed cross section as the only graphical information of the actual layout at the site. In his evaluation, the staff member of the permitting authority feels there is insufficient data on the existing configuration, i.e. the base on which cover will be placed, and he requires the applicant to provide another cross section based on field measurements across the west side. The evaluator has reasoned that the west edge of the landfill near the drainageway is steeper and otherwise distinct from the large open side on the south and therefore should be represented accurately and separately in cross section for special examination.




Figure 8. Hypothetical landfill configuration.

CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA REVIEW PROCEDURE

Examine Precipitation Records

Step 5

The application should include data on the precipitation to be expected at the site. A useful record typically gives average amounts for a period of at least several years in the past, e.g. the average monthly precipitations from the last 20 years or thereabout. Average data can be supplemented with typical records of rainfall on a daily or even hourly basis for a better picture of rainfall distribution in detail. The source of all climatological data should be given also so that verifications can be made. Figure 9 is a map of average annual precipitation that the evaluator can use to check roughly the expected annual precipitation provided by the applicant. Similar information is available for Alaska and Hawaii. In some mountainous or coastal regions the average rainfall can vary over short distances, and special care must be exercised in evaluation as illustrated by the following example.




Figure 9. Average annual precipitation in inches (US Dept of Agriculture)

Example: Precipitation records provided in the permit application concerning a landfill for a city in the Pacific Northwest are those compiled from the downtown weather station. The evaluator recognizes that there is a difference in the weather at the downtown location (near

sea level) and the weather at the landfill which is located in foothills at the far end of the same county. Therefore, he requests more representative data or conclusive evidence that any departures will be on the conservative side.

Examine Evapotranspiration Estimates

Step 6

Since evapotranspiration operates in an important manner to remove moisture from the cover, it must be regarded as a major factor in cover design. Therefore, an applicant should include in documentation an accurate estimate of monthly evapotranspiration as evidence that this factor has been included in the design. The source of information should be included also. Where the evapotranspiration data have been derived through calculations from other parameters, the calculations should be included and explained, and references should be made to original sources. Figure 10 is a map of average annual lake evaporation over the contiguous United States which the evaluator can use to check roughly the expected annual evapotranspiration. Evapotranspiration approximately equals lake evaporation which is about $0.7 \times$ pan evaporation.




Figure 10. Average annual lake evaporation in inches, according to the National Weather Service.

Closure covers should be designed not only for average precipitation but also for high rates over short durations. Such information is readily available in the form of design storms for any locality and it is reasonable to expect that the documentation accompanying an application recognize several extreme rainfalls for recurrence intervals of possible interest. For an average size landfill a 1-hour storm and storms of longer duration are of typical interest. The recurrence interval would likely be 10 or 20 years but the applicant should present reasons for choosing specific intervals and storm durations. Figure 11 is an example of summary information available to the evaluator for checking design storm amounts supplied in an application.




Figure 11. Ten-year 1-hour rainfall in inches (US Weather Bureau)

A sequel to the presentation of design storm data is the calculation of flood discharges for ditches and other elements of the drainage system. The calculation in simplest form utilizes the rational equation:

$$Q = C_{RO} \ i \ A$$

where Q = peak discharge, cubic feet/second
 C_{RO} = runoff coefficient
 i^{RO} = rainfall intensity, inches//hour
 A = area of basin, acres

The formula above incorporates the approximation that 1 inch/hour/acre = 1 cubic foot/second. Roughly approximated, the C_{RO} for vegetated clayey soils on flats and slopes are about 0.5 and 0.7 respectively and for vegetated sandy soils on flats and slopes are about 0.2 and 0.4.

SECTION 3

STEPS IN EVALUATION

Steps in this section differ from those in Section 2 by involving actual evaluation of the designs and judgments submitted by the applicant rather than just the examination and ordering of basic data.

COVER COMPOSITION EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The basis for evaluating the composition of the cover is the collection of data on quantities and descriptions supplied with the application.

Evaluate Composition

Step 8

Referring to Table 2,¹ the evaluator should check the soil composition for suitability as cover by establishing the soil's strengths and deficiencies in a general way. Where a soil is rated IV or higher, look for special design features to compensate for deficiencies (e.g., multilayering to supplement a vulnerable soil with other types). Higher rating numbers tend to indicate greater need for special features. There is need, of course, to exercise good judgment when applying a somewhat subjective ranking as that in the table.

In the particularly important function of minimizing infiltration, it may be necessary to reject a simple cover design of one layer and require inclusion of a clay soil layer or other barrier. This necessity may arise where the dominant soil proposed as cover is:

- a. Designated GW, GP, or SP by testing (see Figure 3)
- b. Dispersive and therefore possibly subject to internal erosion (see Reference 1)
- c. Insufficient in volume for cover design

Other options may be to import a more suitable soil type or in some way to improve characteristics by additional treatments.

Example: According to the testing results accompanying the permit application, cover at a solid waste disposal site will consist of gravelly sand classified SW according to the USCS. The permitting authority has previously assigned a high priority to impeding water percolation into the solid waste. The evaluator, therefore, notifies

TABLE 2. RANKING OF USCS SOIL TYPES ACCORDING TO PERFORMANCE OF COVER FUNCTIONS

| USCS Symbol | Typical Soils | Trafficability | | | Water Percolation | | Gas Migration | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Go-No Go (RCI Value)* | Stickiness (Clay, %) | Slipperiness (Sand-Gravel, %) | Impede (k , cm/s)* | Assist (k , cm/s)* | Impede (H_c , cm)* | Assist (H_c , cm)* |
| GW | Well-graded gravels, gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines | I (>200) | I (0-5) | I (95-100) | X (10^{-2}) | III | X (6) | I |
| GP | Poorly graded gravels, gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines | I (>200) | I (0-5) | I (95-100) | XII (10^{-1}) | I | IX --- | II |
| GM | Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures | III (177) | III (0-20) | III (60-95) | VII (5×10^{-4}) | VI | VII (68) | IV |
| GC | Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures | V (150) | VI (10-50) | V (50-90) | V (10^{-4}) | VIII | IV --- | VII |
| SW | Well-graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines | I (>200) | II (0-10) | II (95-100) | IX (10^{-3}) | IV | VIII (60) | III |
| SP | Poorly graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines | I (>200) | II (0-10) | II (95-100) | XI (5×10^{-2}) | II | VII --- | IV |
| SM | Silty sands, sand-silt mixtures | II (179) | IV (0-20) | IV (60-95) | VIII (10^{-3}) | V | VI (112) | V |
| SC | Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures | IV (157) | VII (10-50) | VI (50-90) | VI (2×10^{-4}) | VII | V --- | VI |
| ML | Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands, or clayey silts with slight plasticity | IX (104) | V (0-20) | VII (0-60) | IV (10^{-5}) | IX | III (180) | VIII |
| CL | Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays | VII (111) | VIII (10-50) | VIII (0-55) | II (3×10^{-8}) | XI | II (180) | IX |
| OL | Organic silts and organic silty clays of low plasticity | X (64) | V (0-20) | VII (0-60) | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MH | Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts | VIII (107) | IX (50-100) | IX (0-50) | III (10^{-7}) | X | --- | --- |
| CH | Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays | VI (145) | X (50-100) | X (0-50) | I (10^{-9}) | XII | I (200-400+) | X |
| OH | Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silts | XI (62) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pt | Peat and other highly organic soils | XII (46) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Same k values as for Impede Water PercolationSame H_c values as for Impede Gas Migration

(continued)

TABLE 2. (continued)

| USCS Symbol | Fire Resistance | Erosion Control | | Dust Control | Reduce Freeze Action | | Crack Resistance (Expansion, %) |
|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | Water (K-Factor)* | Wind (Sand-Gravel, %) | | Fast Freeze (H _c , cm)* | Saturation (Heave, mm/day) | |
| GW | Same as Impede Gas Migration | I (< .05) | I (95-100) | Same ranking and values as for Wind Erosion Control | X | I (0.1-3) | I (0) |
| GP | | I --- | I (95-100) | | IX | I (0.1-3) | I (0) |
| GM | | IV --- | III (60-95) | | VII | IV (0.4-4) | III --- |
| GC | | III --- | V (50-90) | | IV | VII (1-8) | V --- |
| SW | | II (.05) | II (95-100) | | VIII | II (0.2-2) | I (0) |
| SP | | II --- | II (95-100) | | VII | II (0.2-2) | I (0) |
| SM | | VI (.12-.27) | IV (60-95) | | VI | V (0.2-7) | II --- |
| SC | | VII (.14-.27) | VI (50-90) | | V | VI (1-7) | IV --- |
| ML | | XIII (.60) | VII (0-60) | | III | X (2-27) | VI --- |
| CL | | XII (.28-.48) | VIII (0-55) | | II | VIII (1-6) | VIII (1-10) |
| OL | | XI (.21-.29) | VII (0-60) | | --- | VIII --- | VII --- |
| MH | | X (.25) | IX (0-50) | | --- | IX --- | IX --- |
| CH | | IX (.13-.29) | X (0-50) | | I | III (0.8) | X (>10) |
| OH | | VIII --- | --- | | --- | --- | IX --- |
| Pt | | V (.13) | --- | | --- | --- | --- |

(continued)

TABLE 2. (continued)

| USCS Symbol | Side Slope | | Discourage Burrowing | Impede Vector Emergence | Discourage Birds | Support Vegetation | Future Use | |
|----------------|------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| | Stability | Seepage | Drainage | | | | Natural | Foundation |
| GW | | | | X | | X | | |
| GP | | | | X | | X | | |
| GM | | | | VIII | | VI | | |
| GC | | | | V | | V | | |
| SW | | | | IX | | IX | | |
| SP | | | | IX | | IX | | |
| SM | | | | VII | | II | | |
| SC | | | | IV | | I | | |
| ML | | | | VI | | III | | |
| CL | | | | III | | VII | | |
| OL | | | | VI | | IV | | |
| MH | | | | II | | IV | | |
| CH | | | | I | | VIII | | |
| OH | | | | --- | | VIII | | |
| Pt | | | | --- | | III | | |

Determine on basis of laboratory testing

Same ranking and values as for Impede Water PercolationSame ranking and values as for Assist Water PercolationSame ranking and values as for Slipperiness Trafficability

All soils are suitable

Same ranking as for Support VegetationSame ranking and values as for Go-No Go Trafficability

* RCI is rating cone index, k is coefficient of permeability, H_c is capillary head, and K-Factor is the soil erodibility factor.
The ratings I to XIII are for best through poorest in performing the specified cover function.

the applicant that the SW soil (well graded sand) is unacceptable (ranked IX in Table 2) in a single-layer configuration and that it will be rejected unless a layered system with a barrier layer is incorporated.

Example: The applicant at a site has proposed to use a clayey silt for closure cover. The applicant had previously been asked to obtain at his own expense a series of tests on the soil to determine its tendency towards dispersion. The area has a high rainfall, and its low topography can conceivably cause a detention of runoff with increased opportunity for infiltration. Internal erosion that can affect dispersive soils would conceivably lead to a deterioration of the cover by migration of soil particles into the solid waste below. The laboratory test report in the second submittal of the application confirms that the silty soil has a modest tendency for dispersion. The evaluator concludes that inclusion of a clay barrier is advisable. However, the evaluator goes on to explain that other solutions to the potential problem may be investigated also since the applicant has indicated an interest in treating the dispersive soils with lime in order to flocculate clay particles and reduce their tendency towards dispersion.

The susceptibility of particular soil types to erosion can also be evaluated according to a useful erosion loss equation (see Step 18).

THICKNESS EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The evaluation of closure cover thickness is often of primary importance and the evaluator should devote considerable attention to it. Thickness in excess of a certain established minimum* may be governed by one or more of the following factors:

- a. Coverage
- b. Infiltration
- c. Gas migration
- d. Trafficability and support requirements
- e. Freeze/thaw or dry/soak effects

This list may be extended by addition of other factors of possible concern such as:

*Minimum cover thickness requirements vary from state to state according to experience.

- f. Cracking (factors f,g,h,i are discussed in reference 1)
- g. Differential settlement and offset
- h. Membrane protection
- i. Vegetative requirements

Evaluate coverage

Step 9

The closure cover functions basically to cover solid waste completely, and therefore, some guidance is in order to evaluate for factor a above. A reasonable criterion of adequacy for coverage over irregular solid waste can be offered as follows:

$$T \geq 2R$$

where T is cover thickness and R is relief. The relief is defined for this criterion as the vertical distance from high point to low point of irregularities on the top surface of the solid waste. The size of the area over which this vertical distance should be measured corresponds roughly to the size of the equipment used for placing closure cover. Where intermediate size dozers are to be used, the area within which the relief is measured would be on the order of 20 by 20 feet. In large covering operations where pans or other large pieces of equipment are to be used, the area size could be on the order of 50 feet across.

The applicant may choose to circumvent the requirement of increasing thickness above the established minimum to compensate for relief by smoothing the upper surface of solid waste. Where sand fill is abundantly available, it can be mixed with heterogenous solid waste in roughly equal proportions for a more workable material to achieve a smoother top surface. The sand-waste mixture thus forms a buffer¹ that can improve the performance and longevity of the cover placed above.

Evaluate Thickness for Infiltration

Step 10

Logically, the next criterion to be examined in the evaluation concerns infiltration, b above. Adequacy against infiltration can be evaluated by use of a water balance technique in which input of water on a monthly or daily basis is compared with expected losses from surface runoff and evapotranspiration. Excesses beyond storage capacity of the cover soil are considered to pass through the cover as percolation. The evaluator is referred to another manual⁸ in which the details of a recommended computerized procedure are outlined step by step.

For purposes of evaluating the thickness of the cover, a somewhat abbreviated water balance technique may be useful also. This method has been suggested for predicting percolation by EPA,⁹ and its utility in evaluating or designing cover has been reviewed.¹ The water balance

technique serves to check the effect of increased thickness for providing increased water storage in the cover soil and consequent decrease in percolation. The example below illustrates the technique and its use.

Example: Using a 30-year climate record, the evaluator analyzes the effectiveness of a 2-foot silty sand cover with grass at Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin. Table 3 shows the water balance tabulation. The average annual percolation is calculated to be 3.88 inches. The evaluator next expands this analysis to explore the effects of a much thicker cover on percolation. The result is shown in Table 4. A storage capacity of 8 inches (representing greatly increased thickness) is substituted for the storage of 1.05 inches used in Table 3. The overall effect on cumulative percolation is small, with a reduction by only about 20 percent to an annual percolation of 3.13 inches. His analysis indicates to the evaluator that increasing cover thickness is not an efficient way of reducing percolation in this area.

Evaluate Thickness for Gas Migration

Step 11

Thickening the cover may be a direct and effective procedure for reducing gas migration through the cover, especially to the extent that increased thickness enhances maintenance of a high moisture content. The technique is especially attractive for remedial work where problems are localized. Increasing thickness of coarse-grained soils affects gas discharge inversely. In fine-grained soils the open pore space necessary for migration is at least intermittently blocked by the included pore water, and the evaluator must consider this complication critically in arriving at his recommendations.

Example: The cover proposed for a solid waste disposal site in a high-rainfall area consists of a fine-grained soil that basically functions to exclude most percolation. Anticipating eventual problems with gas migration through this cover, the evaluator considers recommending thickening of the cover design. However, after careful consideration, the evaluator concludes that adjustments of the thickness will not have a dramatic effect because the soil usually retains considerable moisture (depending on the complications of rainfall history and evapotranspiration¹) and is already blocking most of the gas movement. The evaluator learns that the applicant believes that thickening the cover to reduce the remaining intermittent, uncontrolled gas discharge will also not be cost-effective and, therefore, thickening is not favored by the applicant. He then concentrates his immediate attention on considering other options such as gas vents though it may be necessary to return later to the thickening technique despite its low cost-effectiveness.

TABLE 3. MONTHLY WATER BALANCE ANALYSIS
IN INCHES FOR CHIPPEWA FALLS, WISCONSIN¹

| Parameter | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Ann. |
|---|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Average Precipitation (P) | 0.89† | 0.71† | 0.77‡ | | | | | | | | 0.67‡ | 1.00† | 4.04 |
| | | | 0.77‡ | 2.55 | 3.73 | 4.19 | 3.65 | 3.56 | 3.37 | 2.04 | 0.67‡ | | 24.53 |
| Runoff (RO) | | | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.04 | | 1.59 |
| Moisture available for infiltration (I) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 2.38 | 3.49 | 3.92 | 3.41 | 3.33 | 3.15 | 1.91 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 22.94 |
| Potential evapotranspiration (PET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.10 | 2.50 | 3.90 | 4.60 | 4.00 | 2.70 | 1.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| (I - PET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 0.02 | -1.19 | -0.67 | 0.45 | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.00 | |
| (Σ neg (I - PET)) | | | | | | (0) | -1.19 | -1.86 | | | | | |
| Soil moisture storage (ST) | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05§ | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.58 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 0.05 | |
| (ΔST) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.78 | -0.14 | +0.45 | +0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| Actual evapotranspiration (AET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.10 | 2.50 | 3.90 | 4.19 | 3.47 | 2.70 | 1.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19.06 |
| Percolation (PRC) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 3.88 |

† Precipitation between November 16 and March 15 is listed as snow but is changed to runoff at spring thaw.

‡ Precipitation in November and March is divided into half rain, half snow.

§ Water-holding capacity is assumed to be at maximum in March when snow melts.

TABLE 4. MONTHLY WATER BALANCE ANALYSIS IN INCHES WITH THICK COVER*

| Parameter | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Ann. |
|---|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Average Precipitation (P) | 0.89† | 0.71† | 0.77‡ | | | | | | | | 0.67‡ | 1.00† | 4.04 |
| | | | 0.77‡ | 2.55 | 3.73 | 4.19 | 3.65 | 3.56 | 3.37 | 2.04 | 0.67‡ | | 24.53 |
| Runoff (RO) | | | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.04 | | 1.59 |
| Moisture available for infiltration (I) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 2.33 | 3.49 | 3.92 | 3.41 | 3.33 | 3.15 | 1.91 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 22.94 |
| Potential evapotranspiration (PET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.10 | 2.50 | 3.90 | 4.60 | 4.00 | 2.70 | 1.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| (I - PET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 0.02 | -1.19 | -0.67 | 0.45 | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.00 | |
| (Σ neg (I - PET)) | | | | | | (0) | -1.19 | -1.86 | | | | | |
| Soil moisture storage (ST) | 8.00 | 8.00 | 8.00§ | 8.00 | 8.00 | 8.00 | 6.89 | 6.33 | 6.78 | 7.49 | 8.00 | 8.00 | |
| (ΔST) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -1.11 | -0.56 | +0.45 | +0.71 | +0.51 | 0.00 | |
| Actual evapotranspiration (AET) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.10 | 2.50 | 3.90 | 4.52 | 3.89 | 2.70 | 1.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19.81 |
| Percolation (PRC) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 3.13 |

* Compare with Table 3.

† Precipitation between November 16 and March 15 is listed as snow but is changed to runoff at spring thaw.

‡ Precipitation in November and March is divided into half rain, half snow.

§ Water-holding capacity is assumed to be at maximum in March when snow melts.

Evaluate Support Requirements

Step 12

The low bearing capacity of some solid waste landfills can be circumvented by increasing soil thickness above waste. In this way the relatively strong soil resists punching and rotational shear. The thickness of soil should be at least 1.5 x the width of footings. However, any proposal to superimpose buildings on the cover should receive particularly critical reviews and would ordinarily be rejected for a hazardous waste site. Past experience with buildings on landfills is replete with cases of structural damage from differential settlement and unnecessary hazard from accumulation of methane and other gases.

Consider Freeze/Thaw and Dry/Soak Effects

Step 13

In cold regions of the country, special attention may need to be directed to disturbing effects of freezing. Similarly in semiarid areas subject to periods of sustained drying conditions, equal concern may be warranted in regard to excessive drying and cracking. The reasons for concern have been summarized elsewhere.¹

The evaluator may check for adequacy of the cover thickness by use of Figure 12 or similar summary. In case of a need for greater detail or in locations of mountainous terrain where the depth of freezing can vary over short distances, the evaluator should seek information on depth of freezing from a local agricultural agency. The depth of drying to be expected over extended droughty periods can similarly be estimated on the basis of experience in the region.

Example: An applicant has proposed to use 3 feet of soil in the northern Great Plains where the average annual maximum depth of freezing is 3 feet. To avoid disturbance of the cover to its full thickness the evaluator recommends that cover thickness be increased to 4 feet.

Before requiring substantial modification by thickening the cover, the evaluator would ordinarily obtain a consensus among selected local engineers that the disturbance of the cover could be significant.

PLACEMENT EVALUATION PROCEDURE

After selection of the material and appropriate thickness for cover, efforts should be directed to the most effective placement and treatment. Cover can be improved in several ways as it is constructed. Materials may be added for better gradation, hauling and spreading equipment can be operated beneficially, and certain layering can be introduced.¹

Evaluate Cover Compaction

Step 14

Some compaction is almost always accomplished during the spreading of cover soil; and this densification is highly effective in producing benefits,






Figure 12. Regional depth of frost penetration in inches.¹¹

principally increasing strength and reducing permeability. Figures 13 and 14 illustrate these effects and provide the evaluator some guidance on what can be achieved. The laboratory compaction test provides a useful data base on which the evaluator can judge the effects of compaction of the cover under consideration. It has been found¹ that soil compacted routinely over soft waste (municipal wastes) falls below standard compaction curves such as obtained in ASTM D698 (Table 1). The differences in field compaction results over spongy solid waste versus those over a hard base can be compensated approximately by using laboratory test procedures with fewer than the "standard" 25 blows of the compacting hammer. Keep in mind that the objective of the laboratory tests is to model actual field compaction of cover soil with dozers and other compacting equipment.

Approximate general guidance (Figure 15) has been derived regarding the field compaction effort necessary in 6 to 12 inches of soil cover on municipal solid waste. Field dry density of the cover can be predicted from measured placement water contents by using laboratory compaction curves at appropriately light compaction effort. For example, where a dozer makes four passes on the average, a 5-blow compaction curve should be determined






Figure 15. Schematic guidance for predicting cover compaction results with intermediate-size dozers on municipal solid waste using laboratory test results.

by laboratory testing and be used for predictions. The curves shown in Figure 15 appear generally valid, but relations between field compaction and laboratory curves should be determined site-specifically if cover density data are deemed necessary;¹ the evaluator may need to make this judgment under Step 2. A reasonable goal for which one might strive, particularly in the compaction of barrier layers, is 90 percent of maximum dry density according to 5- or 15-blow compaction tests. On the other hand, when compacting on a solid base, e.g., on a granular soil-like solid waste, one might strive for 90 percent of maximum dry density by standard 25-blow tests.

Example: In his second submission of an application, an owner/operator has included results of 15-blow compaction tests conducted on the cover soil by a certified testing laboratory (Figure 16). It is claimed later that approximately 90 percent of maximum dry density will be achieved

with six passes of the compacting equipment. The natural water content is approximately 10 percent. The evaluator notes that the cover soil is to be excavated and hauled and placed directly. He therefore asks the applicant to expand on his intentions as far as manipulating the water content of the soil closer to optimum in order to reasonably expect 90 percent of maximum dry density.




Figure 16. Hypothetical cover soil compaction.

Evaluate Internal Layering

Step 15

Layering is a promising technique for final solid waste cover. By combining two or three distinct materials in layers (Figure 17) the designer may mobilize favorable characteristics of each together at little extra expense. The following descriptions¹ should help to guide the evaluation of layered cover designs.

The primary feature in layered systems is usually the barrier. This layer functions to restrict passage of water or gas. Barrier layers are almost always composed of clayey soil that has inherently low permeability; USCS types CH, CL, and SC (Figure 3) are recommended. Soil barriers are susceptible to deterioration by cracking when exposed at the surface, so that a buffer layer above is recommended to protect the clayey soil from excessive drying.





Figure 17. Typical layered cover systems.

Synthetic membranes of butyl or neoprene rubber, hypalon, polyolefin, polyvinyl chloride, etc. may be considered in place of soil barriers.¹ Usually a sheet thickness of at least 20 mils is required. Some membranes should be spread carefully over a smooth base to lie in a relaxed state or a 5-percent slack may be necessary; usually the manufacturers provide directions. Soils immediately above and below a membrane can constitute critical components of the layered cover since irregularities and hard pieces impinging on the membrane can cause damage, particularly during subsequent compaction. Therefore, the application should address thoroughly the question of preserving the integrity of the impermeable membrane during construction. Manufacturer's recommendations for splicing the membrane in the field should be followed and should be detailed in the application. Provide a trench at least 8 inches deep or other anchorage at the top of any slope. The evaluation of synthetic membranes in layered cover systems may benefit from related guidance on basal liner systems presented in another manual;¹⁰ particularly in regard to reactivity between waste and membrane.

Barrier layers may also be constructed by adding certain additives or cements to the available soil. Addition of bentonite clay is a proven means

of reducing permeability, but homogenizing the mixture can present difficulties and may need to be confirmed by laboratory tests, post-placement examination, or other means identified in the permit application. Other additions to soil, such as lime, portland cement, and bituminous cement, may require an even more conservative stance on the part of the evaluator since experiences with these materials in layered covers are quite limited.

Layered cover systems should include buffer soil layers¹ where a buffer layer may be described as a random layer having a subordinate covering function. Buffers serve to protect the barrier layer or membrane sheet from tears, cracks, offsets, punctures, and other deterioration. Below a barrier or the main cover soil a buffer also provides a smooth, regular base. Any soil type will serve as a buffer ordinarily, but it should be free of clods. A properly placed buffer filling voids around barrels of waste serves to minimize settlement and disruption of the final capping cover.

Where layers with grossly discordant grain sizes are joined, there may be a tendency for fine particles to penetrate the coarser layer. As a result, the effectiveness of coarse layers that may be used for water drainage can be reduced by clogging of the pores. Removals from the fine layer may promote additional bad effects, such as internal erosion and settlement. Similar problems can develop around pipe drains buried in the cover system. Such problems are confronted in construction and agriculture, and procedures have been established for choosing grain size for a filter. A widely used criterion is written

$$\frac{D_{15}(\text{filter soil})}{D_{85}(\text{protected soil})} < 4 \text{ to } 5$$

where D_{15} and D_{85} refer to the grain sizes for which 15 and 85 percent by weight of the soils are finer, respectively. Common filter soils are SP, SM, ML, and MH (Figure 3); filter fabric or cloth may be considered in place of a soil filter layer.

Example: Suppose that grain-size distribution curves have been submitted with the application to represent soils to be used in a layered system. The evaluator locates the D_{15} and D_{85} grain sizes at the points shown in Figure 18. Since the ratio of these sizes does not meet the criterion, the application is returned for modification of design.

A water drainage layer, blanket, or channel may be designed into cover in numerous ways to provide a path for water to exit rapidly. Well sorted (poorly graded) sand and gravel are recommended as effective drainage materials, i.e. soils classified GP and SP. Drainage channels and layers may be associated with a system of buried pipe drains but the expense of this combined system ordinarily limits its applicability to high-priority disposal areas.




Figure 18. Hypothetical size gradation of ineffective filter soil.

Gas drainage layer and vents may have granular consistency and interconnections and general configuration similar to those of the water drainage layer or channel. Both layer types function to transmit preferentially. The position in the cover system is a main distinction. The gas drainage layer is placed on the lower side to intercept gases rising from waste cells whereas the drain for water is positioned on the upper side to intercept water percolating from the surface. Figure 19 illustrates a passive gas




Figure 19. Passive collecting and venting system of laterals in gravel trenches above waste cell.

vent design concept, but the pressure-induced draft systems are preferred to passive vents in most cases. Details of the systems should be included in the permit application.

Evaluate Top Soil

Step 16

A top soil or a subsoil made amenable to supporting vegetation frequently forms the top of a layered cover system. Untreated subsoils are seldom suitable directly, so it has been necessary frequently to supplement subsoil with fertilizers, conditioners, etc., as explained elsewhere (Steps 24-26) to obtain the desired result. Loams or USCS types GM, GC, SM, SC, ML, and CL (Figure 3) are recommended but agronomic considerations usually prevail. The upper lift should be placed in a loose condition and not compacted.

Review Proposed Construction Techniques

Step 17

The application should be carefully reviewed for conformance to the following general recommendations¹ for layering (from the bottom up):

- a. Make buffer layer below barrier thick and dense enough to provide smooth, stable base for compacting in c. below.
- b. Compact all layers except topsoil and top lift of upper buffer.
- c. In barrier layer, consider striving for 90 percent of maximum dry density according to 5- or 15-blow compaction test where solid waste is soft or according to standard 25-blow compaction test where solid waste is granular and soil-like.
- d. Cover barrier layer soon enough to prevent excessive drying and cracking.
- e. Provide sufficient design thickness to assure performance of layer function; specifying a 6- to 12-inch minimum should prevent excessively thin spots resulting from poor spreading techniques.
- f. Construct in plots small enough to allow rapid completion.
- g. Consider seeding topsoil at time of spreading.

CONFIGURATION EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The concern for the configuration of the cover surface is driven mostly by a concern to avoid excessive erosion or excessive infiltration. Not only is erosion objectionable in itself but erosion can degrade the cover and seriously reduce its effectiveness.

The USDA universal soil loss equation (USLE) is a convenient tool for use in evaluating erosion potential. The USLE predicts average annual soil loss as the product of six quantifiable factors. The equation is:

$$A = R K L S C P$$

where A = average annual soil loss, in tons/acre

R = rainfall and runoff erosivity index

K = soil erodibility factor, tons/acre

L = slope-length factor

S = slope-steepness factor

C = cover/management factor

P = practice factor

The data necessary as input to this equation are available to the evaluator in a figure and tables included below. Note that the evaluations in Step 8 on soil composition and Steps 23-29 on vegetation all impact on the evaluation of erosion also.

Factor R in the USLE can be calculated empirically from climatological data. For average annual soil loss determinations, however, R can be obtained directly from Figure 20. Factor K, the average soil loss for a given soil in



Figure 20. Average annual values of rainfall-erosivity factor R .¹¹

a unit plot, pinpoints differences in erosion according to differences in soil type. Long-term plot studies under natural rainfall have produced K values generalized in Table 5 for the USDA soil types.

TABLE 5. APPROXIMATE VALUES OF FACTOR K FOR
USDA TEXTURAL CLASSES¹¹

| Texture class | Organic matter content | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|------|------|
| | <0.5% | 2% | 4% |
| | K | K | K |
| Sand | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| Fine sand | .16 | .14 | .10 |
| Very fine sand | .42 | .36 | .28 |
| Loamy sand | .12 | .10 | .08 |
| Loamy fine sand | .24 | .20 | .16 |
| Loamy very fine sand | .44 | .38 | .30 |
| Sandy loam | .27 | .24 | .19 |
| Fine sandy loam | .35 | .30 | .24 |
| Very fine sandy loam | .47 | .41 | .33 |
| Loam | .38 | .34 | .29 |
| Silt loam | .48 | .42 | .33 |
| Silt | .60 | .52 | .42 |
| Sandy clay loam | .27 | .25 | .21 |
| Clay loam | .28 | .25 | .21 |
| Silty clay loam | .37 | .32 | .26 |
| Sandy clay | .14 | .13 | .12 |
| Silty clay | .25 | .23 | .19 |
| Clay | 0.13-0.29 | | |

The values shown are estimated averages of broad ranges of specific-soil values. When a texture is near the borderline of two texture classes, use the average of the two K values.

The evaluator must next consider the shape of the slope in terms of length and inclination. The appropriate LS factor is obtained from Table 6. A nonlinear slope may have to be evaluated as a series of segments, each with uniform gradient. Two or three segments should be sufficient for most engineered landfills, provided the segments are selected so that they are also of equal length (Table 6 can be used, with certain adjustments). Enter Table 6 with the total slope length and read LS values corresponding to the percent slope of each segment. For three segments, multiply the chart LS values for the upper, middle, and lower segments by 0.58, 1.06, and 1.37,

TABLE 6. VALUES OF THE FACTOR LS FOR SPECIFIC COMBINATIONS OF SLOPE LENGTH AND STEEPNESS¹¹

| % Slope | Slope length (feet) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 | 600 | 800 | 1000 |
| 0.5 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.20 |
| 1 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.26 |
| 2 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.25 | 0.28 | 0.31 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.38 | 0.40 |
| 3 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.54 | 0.57 |
| 4 | 0.23 | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.40 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.70 | 0.76 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 1.0 |
| 5 | 0.27 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.54 | 0.66 | 0.76 | 0.93 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| 6 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.58 | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| 8 | 0.50 | 0.70 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| 10 | 0.69 | 0.97 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.3 |
| 12 | 0.90 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 5.7 |
| 14 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 7.3 |
| 16 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| 18 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 9.7 | 11.0 |
| 20 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 |
| 25 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 19.0 |
| 30 | 4.0 | 5.6 | 6.9 | 8.0 | 9.7 | 11.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 20.0 | 23.0 | 25.0 |
| 40 | 6.3 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 22.0 | 25.0 | 28.0 | 31.0 | -- | -- |
| 50 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 22.0 | 25.0 | 31.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 60 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 20.0 | 23.0 | 28.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Values given for slopes longer than 300 feet or steeper than 18% are extrapolations beyond the range of the research data and, therefore, less certain than the others.

respectively. The average of the three products is a good estimate of the overall effective LS value. If two segments are sufficient, multiply by 0.71 and 1.29.

Factor C in the USLE is the ratio of soil loss from land cropped under specified conditions to that from clean-tilled, continuous fallow. Therefore, C combines effects of vegetation, crop sequence, management, and agricultural (as opposed to engineering) erosion-control practices. On landfills, freshly covered and without vegetation or special erosion-reducing procedures of cover placement, C will usually be about unity. Where there is vegetative cover or significant amounts of gravel, roots, or plant residues or where cultural practices increase infiltration and reduce runoff velocity, C is much less than unity. Estimate C by reference to Table 7 for cover management conditions anticipated in the application, and consider changes that may take place in time. See Reference 1 for additional guidance.

Factor P in the USLE is similar to C except that it accounts for additional erosion-reducing effects of land management practices that are superimposed on the cultural practices, e.g., contouring, terracing, and

TABLE 7. GENERALIZED VALUES OF FACTOR C FOR STATES
EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS¹¹

| Crop, rotation, and management | Productivity level | |
|---|--------------------|------|
| | High | Mod. |
| | C value | |
| Base value: continuous fallow, tilled up and down slope | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CORN | | |
| C, RdR, fall TP, conv | 0.54 | 0.62 |
| C, RdR, spring TP, conv | .50 | .59 |
| C, RdL, fall TP, conv | .42 | .52 |
| C, RdR, wc seeding, spring TP, conv | .40 | .49 |
| C, RdL, standing, spring TP, conv | .38 | .48 |
| C-W-M-M, RdL, TP for C, disk for W | .039 | .074 |
| C-W-M-M-M, RdL, TP for C, disk for W | .032 | .061 |
| C, no-till pl in c-k sod, 95-80% rc | .017 | .053 |
| COTTON | | |
| Cot, conv (Western Plains) | 0.42 | 0.49 |
| Cot, conv (South) | .34 | .40 |
| MEADOW | | |
| Grass & Legume mix | 0.004 | 0.01 |
| Alfalfa, lespedeza or Sericia | .020 | |
| Sweet clover | .025 | |
| SORGHUM, GRAIN (Western Plains) | | |
| RdL, spring TP, conv | 0.43 | 0.53 |
| No-till pl in shredded 70-50% rc | .11 | .18 |
| SOYBEANS | | |
| B, RdL, spring TP, conv | 0.48 | 0.54 |
| C-B, TP annually, conv | .43 | .51 |
| B, no-till pl | .22 | .28 |
| C-B, no-till pl, fall shred C stalks | .18 | .22 |
| WHEAT | | |
| W-F, fall TP after W | 0.38 | |
| W-F, stubble mulch, 500 lbs rc | .32 | |
| W-F, stubble mulch, 1000 lbs rc | .21 | |

Abbreviations defined:

| | | | |
|-----------|---|----|----------------------|
| B | - soybeans | F | - fallow |
| C | - corn | M | - grass & legume hay |
| c-k | - chemically killed | pl | - plant |
| conv | - conventional | W | - wheat |
| cot | - cotton | wc | - winter cover |
| lbs rc | - pounds of crop residue per acre remaining on surface after new crop seeding | | |
| % rc | - percentage of soil surface covered by residue mulch after new crop seeding | | |
| 70-50% rc | - 70% cover for C values in first column; 50% for second column | | |
| RdR | - residues (corn stover, straw, etc.) removed or burned | | |
| RdL | - all residues left on field (on surface or incorporated) | | |
| TP | - turn plowed (upper 5 or more inches of soil inverted, covering residues) | | |

contour strip-cropping. Approximate values of P, related only to slope steepness, are listed in Table 8. These values are based on rather limited field data, but P has a narrower range of possible values than the other five factors.

TABLE 8. VALUES OF FACTOR P¹¹

| Practice | Land slope (percent) | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| | 1.1-2 | 2.1-7 | 7.1-12 | 12.1-18 | 18.1-24 |
| | (Factor P) | | | | |
| Contouring (P _c) | 0.60 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.80 | 0.90 |
| Contour strip cropping (P _{sc}) | | | | | |
| R-R-M-M ¹ | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.45 |
| R-W-M-M | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.45 |
| R-R-W-M | 0.45 | 0.38 | 0.45 | 0.60 | 0.68 |
| R-W | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.70 | 0.90 |
| R-O | 0.60 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.80 | 0.90 |
| Contour listing or ridge planting (P _{cl}) | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.45 |
| Contour terracing (P _t) ² | ³ 0.6/√n | 0.5/√n | 0.6/√n | 0.8/√n | 0.9/√n |
| No support practice | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

¹ R = rowcrop, W = fall-seeded grain, O = spring-seeded grain, M = meadow. The crops are grown in rotation and so arranged on the field that rowcrop strips are always separated by a meadow or winter-grain strip.

² These P_t values estimate the amount of soil eroded to the terrace channels and are used for conservation planning. For prediction of off-field sediment, the P_t values are multiplied by 0.2.

³ n = number of approximately equal-length intervals into which the field slope is divided by the terraces. Tillage operations must be parallel to the terraces.

Example: An owner/operator proposes to close one section of his small landfill with a sandy clay subsoil cover having the surface configuration shown in Figure 21. The factor R has been established as 200 for this locality. The evaluator questions anticipated erosion along the steep side and assigns the following values to the other factors in the USLE after inspecting Tables 5 through 8:

$$K = 0.14 \quad LS = 8.3 \quad C = 1.00 \quad P = 0.90$$

The rate of erosion for the steep slope of the landfill is calculated as follows:

$$A = 200 (0.14 \text{ tons/acre}) (8.3) (1.00) (0.90) = 209 \text{ tons/acre}$$

This erosion not only exceeds a limit recommended by the permitting authority but also indicates a potential

exposure of solid waste in that side of the landfill. The evaluator therefore recommends that the owner/operator review his plan of closure to reduce the potential erosion. One way that the operator might accomplish this reduction in erosion is by placing additional solid waste along the steep slope in an overlapping wedge as indicated in the figure. Although the new cover would have a greater slope length, the overall effect is to reduce the factor LS and the amount of erosion.




Figure 21. Hypothetical landfill configuration and modification.

Evaluate Surface Slope Inclination

Step 19

Rainfall runoff is increased by increases in inclination of the surface, and accordingly, infiltration decreases. Since erosion also increases with increasing inclination (Step 18), the balance between these opposing considerations often must be carefully evaluated. On slopes of less than 3 percent, the irregularities of the surface and vegetation commonly act as traps for detention of runoff. The value 5 percent has been suggested and used in grounds maintenance¹² as an approximation of an inclination sufficient to facilitate runoff without risking excessive erosion. A quantitative evaluation of the erosional effect of inclination is outlined for factor LS under Step 18.

Slope inclination becomes more critical as inclination is increased. Not only is erosion more serious, but slope mass stability can become a factor on relatively steep side slopes of landfills and surface impoundments. Usually the evaluator will do well to seek assistance from technical agencies experienced in analyzing slope stability since varied strength properties and seepage conditions can greatly complicate the mass stability. As a rough guide, however, the evaluator can usually count on the rule of thumb that not exceeding 1V (vertical) on 4H (horizontal) or other inclination shown by experience or analysis to be relatively stable would assure satisfactory slope performance in most cases.

The vulnerability of knoll-like configurations to wind erosion can be evaluated by the use of Figure 22. An adjustment factor is obtained as an erosion loss percentage of 100 or more in comparison with erosion loss from a similar flat surface. This factor should be used to estimate the effects of sides of landfills that may present a knoll-like configuration toward the prevailing winds.




Figure 22. Knoll adjustment (a) from top of knoll and (b) from upper third of slope.¹³ (Reproduced by permission of Soil Science Society of America.)

Finally, another general rule of thumb¹⁴ provides that 1V on 2H is the maximum slope on which vegetation can be established and maintained, assuming ideal soil with low erodibility and adequate moisture-holding capacity. In soils less than ideal, maximum vegetative stability cannot be attained on slopes steeper than about 1V on 3H. Optimum vegetative stability generally requires slopes of 1V on 4H or flatter.

DRAINAGE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Check Overall Drainage System

Step 20

Examine the documentation to establish that drainage of surface runoff from the covered area and surroundings has been thoroughly addressed. Maps presenting topography or other descriptions of surface configuration should be carefully reviewed to see that rainfall or snow melt on any part of the site is free to move downslope without encountering obstacles that might lead to ponding or excessive erosion. At the same time, a check should be made to see that the slope is not anywhere in excess of the slopes for

flat surfaces and for ditches provided in the regulations. In those places such as the edge of the landfill where slopes may of necessity be relatively steep, a check for adverse effects in the form of excessive erosion should be made as explained elsewhere (Step 18).

Evaluate Ditch Design

Step 21

To confirm the adequacy of drainage ditches, the evaluator should formally check the hydraulic calculations on which design for ditch cross sections are based. This step can be important but for many landfills may only be necessary where diversion ditches convey runoff from beyond the site around its edge. Calculation should not usually be necessary on the landfill cover itself unless an overflow situation would have serious consequences.

Design (and evaluation) of a ditch is routinely accomplished using the Rational equation (Step 7) and Manning's equation. It was explained in Section 2 that calculations of discharge Q for design storm or storms should be included with the documentation supplied with the application for closure. Q in cubic feet/second is used to calculate ditch cross sections in Manning's equation:

$$Q = \frac{1.486}{n} A R^{2/3} S^{1/2}$$

where n = coefficient of roughness
 A = area, square feet
 R = hydraulic radius, feet
 S = energy gradient, feet/foot

The Manning n value is usually obtained from a table and that authoritative reference should be cited in the application to facilitate checking. For a rough check, use $n = 0.02$. The S in the equation is simply the longitudinal inclination of the ditch.

The design amounts to a manipulation of the remaining unknowns A and R within certain constraints. Numerous tables have been developed and are available for assistance in design; again these references should be identified when used. The cross sectional area A of the waterfilled ditch is affected by the choice of shape, e.g., between triangular and trapezoidal. The hydraulic radius R is also affected since it is by definition the area divided by the wetted perimeter formed by the ditch. A final constraint is the requirement that erosion in the ditch be limited by limiting discharge velocity Q/A to an appropriate maximum from among those determined as critical for the range of soil types (Table 9).

Evaluate Culvert Design

Step 22

Evaluations of culverts and other closed structures that may occasionally be used as a part of the drainage system are approached in approximately

TABLE 9. THRESHOLD VELOCITY FOR EROSION IN DITCHES

| Soil | V_{\max} , feet/second |
|--------|--------------------------|
| GP | 7-8 |
| GW, GC | 5-7 |
| GM | 2-5 |
| SC | 3-4 |
| SM | 2-3 |
| SW, SP | 1-2 |
| CL, CH | 2-3 |
| ML, MH | 3-5 |

the same way as Step 21. An added complication is the capacity of the structure to transmit the water. Where the capacity is too small, water will back up and form a pond, at least temporarily.

VEGETATION EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Rapid establishment and maintenance of vegetation can be accomplished on soil covering solid waste only by carefully addressing soil type, nutrient and pH levels, climate, species selection, mulching, and seeding time.¹ Fertile soils, if available at all for landfill cover, are usually cost-prohibitive, so that nonproductive soils or subsoils often have to be used. County agricultural agents may be able to provide guidance.

Evaluate Soil Suitability for Vegetation

Step 23

Soil composed of a mixture of clay, silt, and sand such that none of the components dominates is called a loam. The stickiness of the clay and the floury nature of the silt are balanced by the nonsticky and mealy or gritty characteristics contributed by the sand. A loam is rated overall best for supporting vegetation as it is easily kept in good physical condition and is conducive to good seed germination and easy penetration by roots.

Clay-rich soils may be productive when in good physical condition, but they require special management methods to prevent puddling or breaking down of the clay granules. Silt-rich soils lack the cohesive properties of clay and the grittiness of sand, are water retentive, and usually are easily kept in good condition. Soils made up largely of sand can be productive if sufficient organic matter is present internally or as a surface mulch to hold nutrients and moisture; sandy soils tend to dry out very rapidly and lose nutrients by leaching.

Remember that worthwhile steps in establishing vegetation may be to stockpile and then to reuse the original topsoil. The less fertile underlying soil will be available as daily or intermediate cover. As the operation nears completion, the stockpiled topsoil can be used in the final cover to facilitate rapid growth of grasses and/or shrubbery. The original topsoil must be significantly more fertile than underlying soil strata; otherwise, stockpiling is not practical or economical.

Evaluate pH Level

Step 24

Tests should be made to determine pH and buffering capacity (usually stated as tons/acre of lime necessary to adjust the soil pH to around 6.5). The amount of lime necessary to neutralize a given soil depends upon soil pore-water pH and "reserve acidity." The reserve acidity is a single factor which incorporates several variables; soils with high levels of organic matter and/or clay require higher amounts of lime for pH adjustment. The pH of subsoil (where appreciable in the cover) also influences lime requirements; acidic subsoils require higher levels and repetitive applications of lime. Some buried landfill wastes act much like acid subsoils making higher lime application levels or more frequent liming intervals necessary for adequate pH control.

Evaluate Nitrogen and Organic Matter

Step 25

Nitrogen is of special importance in establishing vegetation because it is needed in relatively large amounts during vigorous growth but is easily lost from the soil. Nitrogen fertilizer requirements depend upon the amount of organic matter present (higher organic matter levels requiring higher application rates), the soil texture (more is required on sandy soils), and the seed mixture chosen (more is required for grasses than legumes). Generally 50 to 85 lb/acre of nitrogen are recommended. Fertilizers are rated by the amount of nitrogen they contain per weight of fertilizer (e.g. 6 percent nitrogen). To calculate the amount of fertilizer necessary to furnish the recommended amount of nitrogen, simply divide the recommended application by the fractional amount of nitrogen the fertilizer to be used contains. For example, to apply 50 lb/acre nitrogen using fertilizer which is 6 percent nitrogen, divide 50 by 0.06 to get 833 lb/acre fertilizer required. Table 10 indicates typical ranges of organic matter in different soil types and a rough range of nitrogen levels present in a typical loam with moderate levels of organic matter.

Evaluate Other Nutrients

Step 26

Necessary levels of phosphorus in soil are shown in Table 10. Unlike nitrogen, phosphorus is not mobile in the soil and thus is lost very slowly to leaching. It is possible to give enough phosphorus in one application to last several growing seasons. Generally at least 15 lb/acre of phosphorus*

*In calculating on the basis of P_2O_5 , remember that percent P_2O_5 is 2.3 times an equivalent percent phosphorus.

TABLE 10. RELATIVE LEVELS OF ORGANIC MATTER AND MAJOR NUTRIENTS IN SOILS¹⁵

| Relative Level* | Organic Matter, percent | | | Nitrogen lb/acre | Phosphorus lb/acre | Potassium lb/acre |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Sand, Loamy Sand | Sandy Loam, Loam, Silt Loam | Clay Loam, Sandy Clay, Clay | | | |
| Very low | <0.6 | <1.6 | <2.6 | <20 | <6 | <60 |
| Low | 0.6-1.5 | 1.6-3.0 | 2.6-4.5 | 20-50 | 6-10 | 60-90 |
| Medium | 1.6-2.5 | 3.1-4.5 | 4.6-6.5 | 50-85 | 11-20 | 91-220 |
| High | 2.6-3.5 | 4.6-5.5 | 6.6-7.5 | 85-125 | 21-30 | 221-260 |
| Very high | >3.5 | >5.5 | >7.5 | >125 | >30 | >260 |

* Medium level is typical of agricultural loam soil. Low levels need supplemental fertilization; high levels need no fertilization under normal circumstances.

is recommended as a starter. The availability of phosphorus to the plant is quite dependent on pH. At optimum pH values (6.2-6.8) amounts of 50 lb/acre are usually adequate; at pH values below 6.2 or between 6.9 and 7.5, about 80 lb/acre is needed for optimum growth. Under very alkaline conditions (pH greater than 7.5), phosphorus levels of 110 lb/acre are required. These recommendations are for raw subsoils, or for sandy or high clay soils of low organic material content.

Potassium is much less important in grass establishment than in legume establishment and maintenance; thus the rate of application depends upon both test results and species to be seeded. A minimum application of 26 lb/acre potassium (32 lb/acre K₂O) as a starter is recommended under any circumstances. Applications can run as high as 230 lb/acre potassium (277 lb/acre K₂O) on impoverished soils where legumes are to be seeded. Potassium is moderately mobile in the soil and is slowly leached out, but one heavy application should be adequate for several growing seasons.

Evaluate Species Selection

Step 27

Each species of grass, legume, shrub, or tree has its own environmental and biological strengths and limitations. Moisture, light, temperature, elevation, aspect, balance and level of nutrients, and competitive cohabitants are all parameters which favor or restrict plant species. The selection of the best plant species for a particular site depends upon knowledge of adapted plants that have the desired characteristics. Table 11 gives the major parameters usually important to species selection and examples of grasses and legumes exhibiting the parameters. Characteristics which almost universally should be given precedence are: low growing and spreading from rhizomes or stolons; rapid germination and development; and resistance to fire, insects, and disease. Plants which are poisonous or are likely to escape the site and become noxious should be avoided.

TABLE 11. IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTICS OF GRASSES AND LEGUMES

| Characteristic | Degree * | Common Examples |
|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Texture | Fine | Kentucky bluegrass, bentgrass, red fescue |
| | Coarse | Smooth brome grass, reed canarygrass, timothy |
| Growth height | Short | Kentucky bluegrass, buffalograss, red fescue |
| | Medium | Redtop, perennial ryegrass |
| | Tall | Smooth brome grass, timothy, switchgrass |
| Growth habit | Bunch | Timothy, big bluestem, sand dropseed, perennial ryegrass |
| | Sod former | Quackgrass, smooth brome grass, Kentucky bluegrass, switchgrass |
| Reproduction | Seed | Red and alsike clover, sand dropseed, rye, perennial ryegrass, field brome grass |
| | Vegetative | Prairie cordgrass, some bentgrasses |
| | Seed and vegetative | White clover, crownvetch, quackgrass, Kentucky bluegrass, smooth brome grass |
| Annual | Summer | Rabbit clover, oats, soybeans, corn, sorghum |
| | Winter | Rye, hairy vetch, field brome grass |
| Perennials | Short-lived | Timothy, perennial ryegrass, red and white clover |
| | Long-lived | Birdsfoot trefoil, crownvetch, Kentucky bluegrass, smooth brome grass |
| Maintenance | Difficult | Tall fescue, reed canarygrass, timothy, alfalfa |
| | Moderate | Kentucky bluegrass, smooth brome grass |
| | Easy | Crownvetch, white clover, birdsfoot trefoil, big bluestem |
| Shallow rooted | Weak | Sand dropseed, crabgrass, foxtail, white clover |
| | Strong | Timothy, Kentucky bluegrass |
| Deep rooted | Weak | Many weeds |
| | Strong | Big bluestem, switchgrass, alfalfa, reed canarygrass |
| Moisture | Dry | Sheep fescue, sand dropseed, smooth brome grass |
| | Moderate | Crested wheatgrass, red clover |
| | Wet | Reed canarygrass, bentgrass |
| Temperature | Hot | Lehman lovegrass, fourwing saltbush, ryegrass |
| | Moderate | Orchard grass, Kentucky bluegrass, white clover |
| | Cold | Alfalfa, hairy vetch, smooth brome grass, slender wheatgrass |

*Variety, specific characteristic, subcharacteristic, or favored condition.

A very large number of species of grasses and legumes are available for reclamation use. Species that find wide and frequent application are described in Tables 12 and 13. A local agronomist should be consulted for recommendation of locally adapted plant varieties.

Evaluate Time of Seeding

Step 28

Probably the most critical of all decisions in the successful establishment of vegetative cover on poor soils is the time of seeding. The optimum time of seeding depends on the species selected and the local climate. Best seeding time under normal circumstances is presented in Tables 12 and 13 for the recommended grasses and legumes. A local county agent or seed house should be consulted for more specific local information.

Most perennials require a period of cool, moist weather to become established to the extent that they can withstand a cold winter freeze or hot summer drought. Early fall (late August in the north through October in the south) usually allows enough time for the plants to develop to the stage that they can withstand a hard winter. Plants then have a good start for early spring growth and can reach full development before any summer drought. Spring planting is usually second choice for all but a few of the more rapidly developing perennials. Germination and early development are

TABLE 12. GRASSES COMMONLY USED FOR REVEGETATION*

| Variety | Best Seeding Time | Seed Density† seeds/ft ² | Important Characteristics | Areas/Conditions of Adaptation |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Redtop bentgrass | Fall | 14 | Strong, rhizomatous roots, perennial | Wet, acid soils, warm season |
| Smooth brome | Spring | 2.9 | Long-lived perennial | Damp, cool summers, drought resistant |
| Field brome | Spring | 6.4 | Annual, fibrous roots, winter rapid growth | Cornbelt eastward |
| Kentucky bluegrass | Fall | 50 | Alkaline soils, rapid grower, perennial | North, humid, U.S. south to Tennessee |
| Tall fescue | Fall | 5.5 | Slow to establish, long-lived perennial, good seeder | Widely adapted, damp soils |
| Meadow fescue | Fall | 5.3 | Smaller than tall, susceptible to leaf rust | Cool to warm regions, widely adapted |
| Orchard grass | Spring | 12 | More heat tolerant but less cold resistant than smooth brome or Kentucky bluegrass | Temperate U.S. |
| Annual ryegrass | Fall | 5.6 | Not winter hardy, poor dry land grass | Moist southern U.S. |
| Timothy | Fall | 30 | Shallow roots, bunch grass | Northern U.S., cool, humid areas |
| Reed canarygrass | Late summer | 13 | Tall coarse, sod former, perennial, resists flooding and drought | Northern U.S., wet, cool areas |

* Taken from many sources, but especially 15 and 16.

† Number of seeds per square foot when applied at 1 lb/acre.

TABLE 13. LEGUMES COMMONLY USED FOR REVEGETATION

| Variety | Best Seeding Time | Seed Density† seeds/ft ² | Important Characteristics | Areas/Conditions of Adaptation |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Alfalfa (many varieties) | Late summer | 5.2 | Good on alkaline loam, requires good management | Widely adapted |
| Birdsfoot trefoil | Spring | 9.6 | Good on infertile soils, tolerant to acid soils | Moist, temperate U.S. |
| Sweet clover | Spring | 6.0 | Good pioneer on non-acid soils | Widely adapted |
| Red clover | Early spring | 6.3 | Not drought resistant, tolerant to acid soils | Cool, moist areas |
| Alsike clover | Early spring | 16 | Similar to red clover | Cool, moist areas |
| Korean lespedeza | Early spring | 5.2 | Annual, widely adapted | Southern, U.S. |
| Sericea lespedeza | Early spring | 8.0 | Perennial, tall erect plant, widely adapted | Southern, U.S. |
| Hairy vetch | Fall | 0.5 | Winter annual, survives below 0°F, widely adapted | All of U.S. |
| White clover | Early fall | 18 | World-wide, many varieties, does well on moist, acid soils | All of U.S. |
| Crownvetch | Early fall | 2.7 | Perennial, creeping stems and rhizomes, acid tolerant | Northern U.S. |

* Taken from many sources but mainly 15 and 16.

† Number of seeds per square foot when applied at 1 lb/acre.

slowed due to the cool early spring weather. Late frosts often severely damage the young plants. Late spring planting does not allow enough time for most perennials to mature before summer and annuals will usually out-compete the preferred perennials.

Annuals generally are best planted in spring and early summer. Growth is completed quickly before the summer heat and the soil moisture is used up. During this period annuals easily out-compete the perennials. Annuals can, however, be planted any time the soil is damp and warm when a quick plant cover is desired and often will provide an acceptable mulch for fall seeded perennials.

Evaluate Seed and Surface Protection

Step 29

Bare soil as a seeding medium suffers from large temperature and moisture fluctuations and from rapid degeneration due to wind and water erosion. Mulches provide temporary protection against these influences and therefore the use of mulch should be expected in the plan for closure cover.

Almost any material spread, formed or simply left on the soil surface will act as a mulch, e.g., straw and other crop residues, sawdust, wood chips, wood fiber, bark, manure, brush, jute or burlap, gravel, stones, peat, paper, leaves, plastic film, and various organic and inorganic liquids. For straw used where erosion is not anticipated, an application of 1.5 tons/acre is

recommended. On slopes or elsewhere where erosion threatens, 2 tons/acre produces better results. Application rates over 2.5 tons/acre often result in reduced germination and emergence and such high rates should be avoided.

Rapid growing, summer cover crops can be used to advantage as living mulches if final grade work is finished in late spring or early summer when chances of successful perennial grass-legume seedings are low. Coarse grasses such as Sudan grass or a local equivalent are good choices as they are widely adaptable and the tall, stiff stalks are most effective as a mulch.

Petroleum-based products such as asphalt and resins are often suitable and are frequently used as mulching materials. Specially formulated emulsions of asphalt under various trade names have been used throughout the world to prevent erosion, reduce evaporation, promote seed germination, and warm the soil to advance the seeding date. The film clings to but does not deeply penetrate the soil; it is not readily destroyed by wind and rain and remains effective from 4 to 10 weeks. Application rates of 1000-1200 gallons/acre are usually required to control erosion. Asphalt mulches cost about twice the applied cost of a straw mulch.

SECTION 4
POST-CLOSURE PLAN

Provisions for maintenance and for contingencies after site closure should follow a logical plan.

MAINTENANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Some cover deterioration like erosion can be tolerated where the post-closure plan has provisions for frequent, regular maintenance. Elsewhere regular maintenance of the cover may be planned on a less frequent interval, in which case a more conservative cover design is necessary at the start.

Evaluate Design/Maintenance Balance

Step 30

Check to see that the plan for closure covering generally achieves a reasonable balance between initial design and plans for monitoring, maintenance, and repair. So many specific factors (climate, waste type, soil, vegetation, etc.) are involved in evaluating this balance that little detailed guidance can be offered; nevertheless the assessment is important and should be performed with care and diligence. The following example helps clarify the general nature of the problem and the recommended philosophy.

Example: In a late modification, the applicant formally proposes to reduce the frequency of post-closure monitoring inspection visits to a remote hazardous waste site by overdesigning the closure cover at the start. A certain period between inspection visits has become more or less standard in the region on the basis of experience, but the applicant now proposes to double this period. The overdesign amounts to prescribing a thicker cover than might ordinarily be considered sufficient. In this case the evaluator rejects the proposed modification of less frequent inspections. He reasons that emergency conditions such as from wind or water erosion or from cover cracking can compound and intensify the problem in a short period in this region and therefore frequent inspections are imperative and necessary.

Evaluate Maintenance of Vegetation

Step 31

After vegetation is established on a landfill, maintenance is necessary to keep less desirable, native species from taking over and weak areas in the

cover from developing. In most areas judicious, twice-yearly mowing will keep down weed and brush species. Annual fertilization (and liming if necessary) will generally allow desirable species to out-compete the weedy species of lower quality. Occasional use of selective herbicides usually controls noxious invaders, but care must be taken to avoid injuring or weakening the desirable species, lest more harm than benefit results in the long run. In rare circumstances, large insect populations may threaten the stand of vegetation so that insecticide application becomes desirable. The evaluator should review the intermediate and long-range plans for maintaining vegetation with cognizance of plant needs in establishment (and reestablishment) as outlined in Steps 24-29.

Landfill cover soils are usually shallow and of low quality for growing high-quality vegetation. This problem is greatly compounded if an impervious clay or plastic barrier is incorporated in the cover. Such a barrier makes the plant-root zone susceptible to swamping after moderate rains since vertical drainage is impeded. Upon saturation, the soil becomes anaerobic and roots in the system are threatened. Short periods of swamping will weaken the vegetation; longer periods may cause a complete loss. Swamping tolerant species (such as Reed canary grass) and surface drainage will lessen these problems.

On the other extreme, the thin soil dries excessively during dry periods. No deep soil moisture is available to tide the plants over even moderate droughts. Plants which have been weakened by prior waterlogging or that are not drought-tolerant are especially vulnerable. Irrigation may be necessary during prolonged dry spells to preclude complete loss of plant cover.

Landfills may continue to produce gases and soluble organic decomposition products for years after closure, and vegetation can be damaged. An impervious cover over the landfill may shield the plant roots from these products and also keeps the landfill dry so that gas production is low or nonexistent. Deep-rooted shrubs or trees are usually not recommended on landfills since roots will tend to penetrate into the waste zone.

Evaluate Provisions for Condition Surveys

Step 32

Applications for closures should include plans for monitoring the site in the future. An annual site visit by a technical person qualified to evaluate the condition of the cover may be considered sufficient by the permitting authority for some sites. Elsewhere, however, it may be judged that more frequent inspections are necessary. Provisions should be made in the application for collecting documentation during the site visit. The documentation and inspection reports should be kept on site by the owner/ operator or at some other location where it can be examined conveniently. Copies of the reports including all significant observations or conclusions should be kept in the applicant's file for review on request by the overseeing agency.

Example: The evaluator has reviewed an application for closing a site and found that there is sufficient planning to monitor site conditions over an extended period. He notes, however, that the site visits are to be made by a representative of the owner/operator with no provision for a state or EPA representative to accompany the inspector. Among changes he requires in this application, therefore, is the stipulation in the post-closure plan that the state agency (or EPA) will be notified five days before the site visit so that they may send a representative.

CONTINGENCY PLAN EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Evaluate Plan for Erosion Damage Repair

Step 33

Long-term maintenance helps to avoid erosion problems. However, unusual climate conditions and shortcomings in the design occasionally cause excessive erosion by wind or water even on well-maintained covers.

Factors that need to be considered in the plan include the future source of supply of fill soil for repair and the ability of someone to undertake the repair work. The extent of repair work should be detailed in words to the effect that repair work will bring lines and grades at least to their original configuration. It is also appropriate to expect that the remedial work will involve redesign where excessive erosion indicates that the original design was deficient. Some of the many options that might be mentioned for consideration in the case of a necessity for repair would include construction of berms, protection of slopes and channels by riprap, and the use of other special energy dissipators such as check dams.

In anticipation of major problems of sheet erosion across entire surfaces such methods as terracing might be identified, provided their effect on infiltration is not excessively adverse.

In those regions where wind erosion can present a serious problem, the post-closure plan should include specific statements on correcting wind erosion problems. The following example is illustrative of the recommended attitude.

Example: Consider a site in the southern Great Plains. An applicant proposes to dispose of waste in a trench operation in which soil excavated from the trench will be used as final cover. Since a considerable mound will have been formed upon closure, the evaluator foresees the possibility of eventual wind erosion. No provision with specifics for timely repair addresses this possible erosion problem, so the evaluator recommends that the applicant develop contingencies accordingly. The evaluator offers for consideration the use of snow fences as one quick response technique.

Evaluate Plan for Vegetation Repair

Step 34

Waste disposal areas have long-lived potential for negative impact and permanent vegetative cover should be maintained. Once a cover of vegetation is started and stabilized, extensive root systems develop and decomposition processes form a layer of humus capable of perpetuating the cover of vegetation. However, erosion forces, burrowing animals, etc., may damage parts of this cover of soil, humus, and vegetation. Provisions should be made for repairing such damage, specifically for transplanting grass sod, planting the new seeds or shrubs, and replacing eroded soil during the inactive life of the area.

The principal part of the application documents that the evaluator should carefully review is that part dealing with measures to return damaged vegetation to a state such as originally planned (see VEGETATION EVALUATION PROCEDURES, SECTION 2). One additional facet of the plan for maintenance of vegetation is the fact that deterioration of the vegetative cover is often widespread; swampiness or droughtiness, nutrient starvation, or methane migration in the cover quickly affects the entire vegetation system. Exceptions are problems induced by erosion, and repair in this case should be of less concern. Because of this potential widespread impact the applicant's plans for maintaining or for repairing the vegetation should be closely tied to the monitoring plan and should be adequate to respond quickly to the early stages of a major problem.

Evaluate Plan for Drainage Renovation

Step 35

The principal part of the applicant's plan for drainage renovation should include sufficient details to assure that the drainage system for the site as designed will be restored quickly to its original condition. In addition to this, the plan for repair should provide for such additional work as becomes necessary after a period of operations. Such additional work might include placement of riprap along a slope subjected to more erosive action than anticipated in the original drainage design. Except for such unexpected problems, the maintenance of drainage should amount to fairly straightforward cleaning of ditches and cutting of brush.

Evaluate Provisions for Other Cover Deterioration

Step 36

Contingency planning should include making provisions for all forms of cover deterioration other than erosion and distress of the vegetation, covered elsewhere. Such deterioration might result from excessive root penetration, cracking, disturbance by cold weather, seepage, and slope instability. The evaluator should consider the likely effectiveness of post-closure plans to addressing such problems in a timely manner. His evaluation should, of course, be made in the context of policies established by state agencies and/or EPA. Such policies need not necessarily assign responsibility for correcting such unanticipated problems to the owner/operator.

REFERENCES

1. Lutton, R. J. et al., "Design and Construction of Covers for Solid Waste Landfills," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report EPA-600/2-79-165, Cincinnati, OH, 1979. PB 80-100381.
2. American Society for Testing and Materials, "Special Procedures for Testing Soil and Rock for Engineering Purposes," Special Technical Publication 479, Philadelphia, PA, 1970.
3. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, "Laboratory Soils Testing," Engineer Manual 1110-2-1906, Washington, D. C., 1970.
4. American Society of Agronomy and American Society for Testing and Materials, "Methods of Soil Analysis," Parts 1 and 2, American Society of Agronomy, Inc., Madison, WI, 1965.
5. Allison, L. E., "Wet Combustion Apparatus and Procedure for Organic and Inorganic Carbon in Soil," Soil Science Society of America Proceedings, Vol 24, pp. 36-40, 1960.
6. Soil Conservation Service, "Soil Survey Laboratory Methods and Procedures for Collecting Soil Samples," Soil Survey Investigations Report No. 1, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., 1967.
7. Decker, R. S. and Dunnigan, L. P., "Development and Use of the Soil Conservation Service Dispersion Test," in Dispersive Clays, Related Piping, and Erosion in Geotechnical Projects, American Society for Testing and Materials, Special Technical Publication 623, pp. 94-109, 1977.
8. Perrier, E. R. and Gibson, A. C., "Hydrologic Simulation on Solid Waste Disposal Sites," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Technical Resource Document (draft), 1980. SW-868.
9. Fenn, D. G. et al., "Use of the Water Balance Method for Predicting Leachate Generation from Solid Waste Disposal Sites," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report SW-168, Cincinnati, OH, 1975.
10. Matrecon, Inc., "Lining of Waste Impoundment and Disposal Facilities," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Technical Resource Document (draft) 1980. SW-870.

11. Stewart, B. A. et al., "Control of Water Pollution from Cropland: Vol I - A Manual for Guideline Development," U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report ARS-H-5-1, Hyattsville, MD, pp. 111, 1975.
12. Conover, H. S., Grounds Maintenance Handbook, 3d ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, pp. 631, 1977.
13. Woodruff, N. P. and Siddoway, F. H., "A Wind Erosion Equation," Soil Science Society of America Proceedings, Vol 29, pp 602-608, 1965.
14. Becker, B. C. and Mills, T. R., "Guidelines for Erosion and Sediment Control Planning and Implementation," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report EPA-R2-72-015, Washington, D. C., 1972. PB 213-119/1BA.
15. Bennett, F. W. and Donahue, R. L., "Methods of Quickly Vegetating Soils of Low Productivity," U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Report EPA-440/9-75-006, Washington, D. C., 1975. PB 253-329/7BA.
16. U. S. Department of Agriculture, "Grass, the Yearbook of Agriculture," House Document No. 480, 80th Congress, Washington, D. C., 1948.