**6.0 Summary and Recommendations**

This Focused Feasibility Study has been prepared on behalf of the MPCA Closed Landfill Program to help inform remedy selection efforts for the Freeway Landfill and Freeway Dump in Burnsville, Minnesota. The evaluation involved a focused set of commonly implemented waste containment technologies that were assembled into five alternatives (Alternative 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, and 3). Alternative 1 would involve taking no action beyond long-term monitoring and maintenance at the existing Landfill and Dump. Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c, which would involve excavation of the waste with placement in a new lined landfill to be constructed on-site, include three variations related to the new landfill height and footprint. Alternative 3 was developed to represent a range of possible off-site disposal options in Dakota County.

The five alternatives were evaluated against the statutory criteria listed in Section 121 of CERCLA and in Section 300.430 of the NCP, as summarized in Table 5-2. Although Alternative 1 (No Action) involves the lowest cost and ease of implementation, the evaluation determined that Alternative 1 does have long term effectiveness and does not meet the threshold criteria for (1) protection of human health and the environment and, and (2) compliance with ARARs. Based on past discussions, Alternative 1 is not supported by key stakeholders, including the City of Burnsville, Dakota County, MPCA CLP, or US EPA.

The other four alternatives are believed to have similar long-term effectiveness, and each meets the FFS threshold criteria for compliance with ARARs and overall protection of human health and the environment. The main differences between the four remaining alternatives involve cost, implementation effort/duration, and the modifying criteria of state and community acceptance (see Table 5-2).

Three liner configurations for Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c were considered in this evaluation, including the base option that meets Minnesota Statute for municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills, an enhanced composite liner with an additional layer of geosynthetic clay liner (GCL), and a double composite liner traditionally used for hazardous waste landfills (see Table 3-1). The nature of the Site and historical waste disposal practices may warrant a more protective landfill liner, and this choice will also depend on community acceptance and legislative processes.

Based on this evaluation, the three Site configurations for Alternate 2 would be the least expensive options. Cost estimates (Table 5-1) for the design and construction of Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c are based on landfill industry standards and actual cost of similar projects. Alternative 2a utilizes the smallest footprint and therefore remains the least expensive option due to economies of scale.

Alternative 3 would involve excavating the waste from Freeway Landfill and Dump and disposing of the waste material in a permitted off-site Solid Waste Disposal Facility. Alternative 3 is estimated to be the most expensive alternative based on several current unknowns, including finding a landfill that has the capacity to handle the volume of waste and the actual disposal fees that will be charged by the landfill. These disposal fees include the trucking, facility operation fees, and city/county/state fees and taxes. As noted in table 5-1, the cost range for disposal of the Freeway Landfill and Dump waste material at an alternative site is estimated to be between $23-$80 per ton.

**Path Forward**

At this time, the MPCA intends to present Alternatives 2a, 2b, 2c, and 3 at a public meeting and solicit public comments on each alternative. The desired outcome after review of the public comments would be to choose which configuration for Alternative 2 would be most acceptable for the public and other government stakeholders (e.g., City of Burnsville, Dakota County, and other regional governing bodies).

Once the preferred configuration from Alternative 2 is selected, the MPCA intends to move forward on the preparation of design and bidding documents for one configuration for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. The design and bidding documents will also consider option pricing for an enhanced bottom liner system to aid in the decision-making process. Dual bids will be posted for one configuration for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, and MPCA will evaluate the proposals and select a contractor for each design alternative for potential award of the construction contract. The bid results will be presented to the Legislature, and the decision to move forward with one of the alternatives will be based on the support and availability of a funding source from the Legislature.