Redline / Strikeout Version
Part III, Appendix III-D.8
Alternative Final Cover Demonstration

Part III Attachment III-D Appendix III-D.8

ALTERNATIVE FINAL COVER DEMONSTRATION

Pescadito Environmental Resource Center
MSW-2374
Webb County, Texas



Initial Submittal March 2015
Revised September 2015
Technically Complete March 11, 2016
Modified August 2017

Prepared for: Rancho Viejo Waste Management, LLC 1116 Calle del Norte

Laredo, TX 78041

Prepared by:

APTIM Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc.

(f/k/a CB&I Environmental & and Infrastructure, Inc.)

This document is released for the purpose of permitting only under the authority of Michael W. Oden, P.E. #67165. It is not to be used for bidding or construction. Texas Registered Engineering Firm F-5650.





12005 Ford Rd, Suite 600 Dallas, TX 75234

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	_1
2.0	Alternate Final Cover System Design	_2
3.0	Equivalency Demonstration requirements	
4.0	Soil loss due to erosion	4
5.0	Help model	_5
	5.1 Input Parameters	_5
6.0	Alternative final cover Quality Control Plan	10
7.0	Conclusion	l 1
<u>1.0</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	1
2.0	Alternate Final Cover System Design	2
<u>3.0</u>	Equivalency Demonstration requirements	3
4.0	Soil loss due to erosion	4
5.0	Help model 55 Input Parameters	
6.0	Alternative final cover Quality Control Plan	
7.0	Conclusion	1

List of Attachments

Attachment III-D.8-1: HELP 3.07 Output

Attachment III-D.8-2: References

This document is released for the purpose of permitting only under the authority of Michael W. Oden, P.E. #67165. It is not to be used for bidding or construction. Texas Registered Engineering Firm F-5650.

Tab	le III-D.8-2: HEI	P Model Input	Parameters				
	AFC Model Runs		Prescriptive Cover Model Runs				
Parameter	AFC_WB13	AFC_WB19	PRE_FC3	PRE_FC4			
General Design and Evapotranspiration Data							
Number of Years Modeled	30	30	30	30			
Runoff Curve Number	92	92	92	92			
Area Allowing Runoff (%)	100	100	100	100			
Evaporative Zone Depth (in)	37	37	25	7			
Maximum Leaf Area Index	1	0	0	0			
Average Annual Wind Speed (mph)	11.6	11.6	11.6	11.6			
Erosion Layer							
Layer No.	1	1	1	1			
-	Vertical	Vertical	Vertical	Vertical			
Layer Type	Percolation	Percolation	Percolation	Percolation			
	(Type 1)	(Type 1)	(Type 1)	(Type 1)			
Thickness (in)	7	7	7	7			
Hydraulic Conductivity	1.0X10 ⁻⁵	1.0X10 ⁻⁶	1.0X10 ⁻⁵	1.0X10 ⁻⁵			
(cm/sec)	1.0X10	1.0X10	1.0X10	1.0710			
Geomembrane Liner							
Layer No.	N/A	N/A	N/A	2			
Layer Type				Flexible Membrane Liner (Type 4)			
Thickness (in)				0.06			
Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)				$2x10^{-132}$			
Infiltration Layer							
Layer No.	2	2	2	3			
Layer Type	Vertical Percolation (Type 1)	Vertical Percolation (Type 1)	Vertical Percolation (Type 1)	Vertical Percolation (Type 1)			
Thickness (in)	30	30	18	18			
Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)	1x10 ⁻⁵	1.0x10 ⁻⁶	1x10 ⁻⁵	1x10 ⁻⁵			
Geomembrane Liner	HILL TO A TOP		The Arthur				
Layer No.			3				
Layer Type	N/A	N/A	Flexible Membrane Liner (Type 4)	N/A			
Thickness (in) Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)			0.06 2x10 ⁻¹ 22				

5.1.7 HELP Model Results

The results of the HELP model are summarized in the table below. The average annual percolation for the bottom-most layer for each final cover figuration is shown in **Table III- D.8-3**. As can be seen, average annual percolation through either of the AFC configurations is less than either of the prescriptive cover configurations.

Table III-D.8-3: HELP Model Results						
Model File Name	Average Annual Percolation					
Model Pile Name	in/year	mm/year				
AFC_WB13	0.00243	0.061722				
AFC_WB19	0.01509	0.383286				
PRE_FC3	0.068 <u>6</u> 9	1.744726				
PRE FC4	0.07 <u>157</u> 511	1.81788907794				

7.0 CONCLUSION

In accordance with TCEQ regulations at 330.457(d)(1) both of the AFCs modeled achieve an equivalent reduction in infiltration compared to the two prescriptive cover scenarios modeled. Therefore, the AFC design provides appropriate protection from infiltration and associated leachate generation.

As demonstrated in **Attachment III.C** the proposed surface water protection and erosion control practices will maintain non-erodible velocities and will minimize soil erosion losses to less than 3 tons/acre/year. All final cover and stormwater management controls have been evaluated and been determined to provide adequate performance for all storms up to the 100-year storm without resulting in erodible velocities without adequate erosion protection.

A geotechnical analysis of the AFC has determined that it will function with appropriate factors of safety, as shown in **Appendix III-D.5**.

The AFC will be constructed in accordance with the Final Cover Quality Control Plan (FCQCP) found in **Appendix III-D.9**. The FCQCP will provide guidance for the materials, equipment, and construction methods to be used for final cover construction and the cover testing, evaluation and reporting procedures.