CROSSROADS

WHICH DIRECTION WILL AMERICA CHOOSE FOR COAL COMBUSTION PRODUCTS?

PLUS:
Annual Production & Use Survey Results

ALSO:
New Features – “Ash Classics” and “In & Around ACAA”
POWDERED

PACT is a new, proprietary process for beneficiating fly ash that is contaminated with powdered activated carbon.

ACTIVATED

Allows marketing of usually disposed ash because it effectively treats PAC.

CARBON

Can be applied on demand to create a sustainable solution.

TREATMENT

PACT™ is a low cost non-hazardous patented chemical application that can be applied directly to fly ash. Since 2008, BMTI has successfully treated approximately 2.5 million tons of fly ash with this process.

For innovative fly ash solutions, optimum concrete performance, and groundbreaking new products, BMTI is the solid choice. With our superior quality products, in depth research, extensive support services, & over 40 years of industry knowledge, BMTI is uniquely positioned to help build & sustain your business.

To learn more about PACT or BMTI’s other technologies, contact us at: 1-800-964-0951 or visit us online at: www.BORALMTI.com
Applications, Science and Sustainability of Coal Ash

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Message from the ACAA Executive Director .................................................. 2
Message from the ACAA Chairman ................................................................. 6

FEATURES

Annual Production and Use Survey .............................................................. 8
Coal Ash at a Crossroads
By John N. Ward, American Coal Ash Association Government Relations Committee Chairman ........ 14
Landfilling Vs. Recycling
By Christopher D. Hardin, PE. ................................................................. 23
Legal Considerations
By Joshua R. More and Ashley L. Thompson ................................................. 27
High Volume Fly Ash Grout
By Drew DeCarlo, Headwaters Resources ..................................................... 34
Ash Classics
By David Goss, Former ACAA Executive Director ........................................ 42
In & Around ACAA ..................................................................................... 45

ACAA Membership
By Annely Noble, ACAA Special Assistant .................................................... 47
Annual American Coal Ash Association Membership Directory ................. 49
Index to Advertisers ..................................................................................... 64

On the Cover
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WHAT A DIFFERENCE A YEAR MAKES
By Thomas H. Adams, Executive Director ACAA

Looking way back to 2010, important activities were occupying the attention of the American Coal Ash Association (ACAA). A mid-term election was taking place. Control of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives was at stake. Many were hopeful that a change in control would help moderate the efforts of the Obama administration to create new, controversial regulations in a wide variety of areas. With regard to the Coal Combustion Products (CCP) disposal issue, a Democrat congressman from North Carolina was trying to help resolve concerns regarding EPA regulations while protecting recycling of CCPs.

In addition, during 2010 the ACAA was completing its response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) proposal to regulate disposal of CCP. Volunteer members of ACAA spent thousands of hours preparing detailed information on the beneficial use of CCP for EPA consideration. On Nov. 19, 2010 the massive ACAA submittal was entered into the docket along with over 450,000 other submittals.

Fast forward one year, and we find a very different reality facing the ACAA. Our advocate in the U.S. House on the Democrat side became a member of the minority as the mid-term election of 2010 created a new majority in the House. With that new majority came a clear position that the EPA was being too aggressive in their regulatory initiatives, including the effort to regulate disposal of CCP.

A Republican freshman from West Virginia, David McKinley, stepped forward to address the CCP issue head-on. Representative McKinley offered two proposals to intercept the EPA desire to create hazardous waste regulations for CCP disposal. First he introduced a prohibition on expenditures to create Subtitle C rules through the end of fiscal 2011. (This amendment to a continuing resolution funding the EPA passed the House but failed in the Senate.) Next Rep. McKinley sponsored a bill to prohibit the EPA from creating Subtitle C, hazardous waste rules for the disposal of CCP.

With support from the House leadership, the bill moved before the Energy and Commerce Committee. Committee staff consulted with stakeholders and suggested modifications to improve the bill and gain sufficient support for passage. The result was HR 2273, which was passed with strong bipartisan support.

The bill has moved on to the U.S. Senate and has been introduced as S 1751. Original sponsors include five Democrats and five Republicans. Currently there are discussions ongoing with Senate staffers, the generators, and state regulators to resolve concerns and gain the necessary votes to pass the bill and send it on to the president. While there is much work to be done to get the bill through the Senate, just the fact that legislation has made it this far is amazing.

Over at the EPA, the Agency continues to work on a final regulation. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson stated late in
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2011 that the agency was undertaking risk evaluations of beneficial uses and would use the findings in creating a final regulation. (The agency had been criticized by its Inspector General for supporting beneficial use through the Coal Combustion Products Partnership (C2P2) program without doing its own risk evaluation).

Based on currently available information, it appears that EPA will be unable to propose a final coal ash disposal regulation before late 2012 at the earliest. The EPA appears to have voluntarily jumped into some quicksand in its effort to regulate CCP disposal. Each move to extricate itself takes the agency a little deeper.

Today the primary objective of the ACAA – to remove the possibility of hazardous waste regulation of CCP disposal as soon as possible – is much closer than anyone would have thought 12 months ago.
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MONUMENTAL ACHIEVEMENTS – AND MORE WORK TO DO

By Mark Bryant, Chairman ACAA, Ameren Energy Fuels & Services

With the book now closed on 2011 and Tampa in the rearview mirror, I can say it was truly a significant year in my life. From a final college tuition payment to a stroll down the aisle with my daughter on my arm or some much needed shoulder surgery 2011 was big. What a year! But like so many of you the pace of life isn’t slowing down.

In case you missed it, we also had a big year at the Association and we accomplished so very much, honestly much more than I ever imagined possible. Passage of the House bill last October was really big. (Passage of a Senate version this year would be huge!) I used to think that gridlock and inaction in Washington was a good thing because a slow government couldn’t mess things up very fast. But these days I would like to see our government do its job on our behalf especially regarding spending reductions, budget deficits and “the economy.” And let’s not forget consideration of our Senate Bill – SB 1751.

But whether the Senate bill moves forward or not does not diminish the success that we continue to build in pursuit of regulatory clarity and a non-hazardous outcome for coal ash. It appears that the coming election will be more a referendum on ideology and culture than a discussion of important issues or even a simple choice of candidate or party. It could be very easy for our issue to get lost in the weeds of these lofty debates. As always, we will keep the faith and continue to work on behalf of the Association and our goals but more importantly on behalf of our friends, family and ourselves.

I hope for all our sakes that one day soon we can get back to the ‘boring’ business of promoting the use of ash and the other CCPs, CCRs or CCBs.”

As I write my last Ash at Work message as Chairman, I can’t begin to describe how proud and impressed I am by the membership and staff of ACAA. Over the last several years we have engaged one significant issue after another, and always just when we needed it most, one (or a few) of our members would come forward with a skill, ability, passion, personal contact, piece of information or financial support at precisely the right time, sometimes just in the nick of time.

Through it all, we have never wavered from our collective singular goal of protecting beneficial use. I am truly thankful for such a talented and motivated group of folks that volunteer and have supported our success. From here on out whatever our endgame is, all we can do is be more successful; failure is no longer possible. I no longer underestimate the ACAA. We should all be proud.

As we work to morph the potential regulations to a non-hazardous outcome we are also evolving as an organization. It seems that lately change is a constant for us. The Association has transitioned from our Denver office to a space within Creative Association Management (CAM) in Farmington Hills, Michigan. This has not been an easy decision and we had quite a bit of help in evaluating the options and two final candidates. At our meeting in Indianapolis the full board unanimously approved hiring CAM to handle regular association duties and affairs. I am thankful for that action and the vote of confidence in the work performed by the evaluation team. I continue to feel as confident as ever that this move is right for us at this time for many reasons including cost efficiency, organizational flexibility and adaptability in the future.

But as I look around and consider the stewardship of this association that we are entrusted to manage and grow, I can identify a few other areas where we may have some updating, refining and polishing yet to do. For instance, we currently have a board of directors that numbers 62 at last count out of 154 total members (members, associates and affiliates). Sixty-two is a large board by any measure.

Our growth is due in no small part to the value received for the dues paid, especially over the last two or three years. Our dues structure allows for any member willing to pay at the required level to have a representative appointed to the board. Full board participation is appreciated at times when we face significant issues like our recent management structure changes. Also, during periods of significant activity, many hands make little work.

During my term, I have elected to include the board in many decisions because transparent direct communication is paramount to me, especially on such bellwether issues as hiring a new Executive
Director or relocating an office and staff, but to bring an issue before the full board takes a lot of time and energy. The unique responsibilities of the Board of Directors are to protect the association and to approve any changes to the governance and by-laws.

These by-laws provide that the more routine issues are better handled by the 12 members of the Executive Committee which are elected by the board for that very purpose. Our by-laws are strong and well written and in this regard we should follow them. But maybe, every member should be a voting member and our Executive Committee should be somewhat more diverse and representative of all categories of our membership?

Similarly, we continue to see some merger and aggregation activity in the utility sector of our member ranks. The economy and power prices are challenging all our travel budgets and forcing many to evaluate attendance at some or all three meetings a year. As we continue to evolve, well considered changes to how our association operates and how we operate to the benefit of our members should be continually reviewed. Change for the sake of change will never gain my support but as good stewards we must always strive to improve.

As I turn over the Association’s Chair to the capable hands of Lisa Cooper and Vice Chair Hollis Walker at this summer’s meeting, I will resolve to remain involved in ACAAs’ work, helping where I can and when I can. Certainly, in our history there have been trials and tests that were survived because of the hard work of those who came before. As I reflect on the terms of Tom Jansen and Al Christianson before me, the “job” of Chair of the Board would’ve been considered boring in comparison to our level of activity, but it has been an exciting four years and I hope for all our sakes that one day soon we can get back to the “boring” business of promoting the use of ash and the other CCPs, CCRs or CCBs.

I am proud of and wish to thank the leadership team of Charles Price, Tom Adams, Lisa Cooper, John Ward, Dave Goss and Bruce Kramer that helped navigate our many challenges and donated countless time, talent and treasure on behalf of the Association.

I must also thank the Executive Committee for their guidance and support. Thanks also to Committee Chairs for the ongoing business at hand and the volunteer members of our special teams that continue to answer the call. A special thanks to my family for their support and to the folks at Ameren for allowing me the time to participate. Lastly, I want to thank my friends who have agreed and supported our decisions throughout the last four years, but I especially want to thank my friends who may not have agreed and who have challenged us to do the time and make the hard calls necessary for the good of the Association. I think we got it right so far. The challenges facing a growing organization in a challenging regulatory and market environment need all of our engagement.

I appreciate your faith and trust and the opportunity to serve and participate in our successes over the past several years. I look forward to many more successful years to come. •

See you soon,
Mark
Coal ash beneficial use rates decline as regulatory uncertainty and “toxic” publicity continue.

The turnaround occurred as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency proposed coal ash regulations that could designate the material as “hazardous waste” when disposed. Growing numbers of ash producers, specifiers and users have begun reducing coal ash use in light of the regulatory uncertainty and publicity surrounding EPA’s activities.

“We are entering the fourth year of an EPA rulemaking process that seems to have no end in sight,” said Thomas H. Adams, executive director of the American Coal Ash Association – an organization that advances the environmentally responsible and technically sound use of coal ash as an alternative to disposal.
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“Our worst fears are being confirmed. The ongoing regulatory uncertainty and a drumbeat of misleading publicity about the toxicity of coal ash are combining to cause decreases in the beneficial use of the material. The loser, unfortunately, is the environment as millions more tons of coal ash needlessly wind up in landfills.”

According to ACAA’s "Production and Use Survey," 42.5 percent of the 130.2 million tons of coal ash produced in 2010 was beneficially used. That use rate is a decline from 44.3 percent in 2009 and a significant reversal of the previous decade’s trend.

“Throughout the 1990s, beneficial use rates were in the 20s,” said Adams. “In 2000, when the rate was 29.7 percent, the EPA issued its Final Regulatory Determination that regulation of ash as a ‘hazardous waste’ was not warranted. Over the next eight years, EPA also began actively promoting the beneficial use of coal ash and the rate soared to 44.5 percent in spite of steadily increasing volumes of the amount of coal ash produced.”

The beneficial use rate stalled in 2008 and 2009 as EPA reopened its coal ash regulatory agenda following the failure of a coal ash disposal facility in Tennessee. In 2010, the recycling rate declined to 42.5 percent and the absolute volume of material recycled declined to 55.3 million tons – down from 60.6 million tons in 2008.

“Supporters of a ‘hazardous waste’ designation for coal ash disposal like to say that higher disposal costs will lead to more recycling. This real world evidence – coupled with the growing list of people ceasing the use of coal ash – completely contradicts that simplistic argument,” said Adams. “The fact is that coal ash disposal costs did not change much between the 1990s and 2000s. What caused the dramatic growth of beneficial use in the 2000s was regulatory certainty that encouraged people to invest in recycling rather than disposal and a supportive EPA that actively encouraged recycling. All of that is gone now. EPA’s ‘Final’ Regulatory Determination turned out not to be ‘Final’ and the Agency has abandoned its support or even meaningful discussion of coal ash recycling.”

Adams said coal ash beneficial use is also being harmed by publicity activities of groups lobbying for a “hazardous waste” designation. “A steady stream of publicity about ‘toxic’ coal ash is causing people to shy away from using the material out of concern for its safety or potential legal implications.”

The following table provides a breakdown of the CCP Use to Production Rate (%): 37.90% 42.30% 60.80% 48.60% 7.10% 41.50% 85.00% 42.50%.
There are many good reasons to view coal ash as a resource, rather than a waste. Using it conserves natural resources and saves energy. In many cases, products made with coal ash perform better than products made without it. For instance, coal ash makes concrete stronger and more durable. It also reduces the need to manufacture cement, resulting in significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. About 11 million tons of greenhouse gas emissions were avoided by using coal ash to replace cement in 2010 alone.

Major uses of coal ash include concrete, gypsum wallboard, blasting grit, roofing granules, and a variety of geotechnical and agricultural applications.

**DETAILED FINDINGS FROM SURVEY**

The American Coal Ash Association has conducted a survey quantifying the production and use of coal ash in the United States each year since 1966. Data is compiled by directly surveying electric utilities and utilizing additional data produced by the U.S. Energy Information Administration. The survey’s results have been widely adopted by federal agencies including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Geological Survey.

**Fly Ash**

beneficial use saw a total increase of almost 4 percent utilization in the total categories reported. Concrete and concrete products consumed nearly 1.3 million more tons in 2010 as compared to 2009, but this number is still well below the 13.7 million tons used in 2007.

Fly ash continues to be the most widely used CCP, with respondents reporting its use in thirteen of the fourteen survey application categories. Fly ash was consumed primarily in concrete products, structural fills, waste stabilization and raw feed as clinker for cement production. ACAA believes the volume of fly ash reported this year for use in cement kilns as raw feed is significantly under-reported based on historical data. We think, but cannot easily substantiate, that nearly 5 million tons of fly ash is used annually in the production of cement clinker, therefore we opted for a more conservative amount.

"Our worst fears are being confirmed. The ongoing regulatory uncertainty and a drumbeat of misleading publicity about the toxicity of coal ash are combining to cause decreases in the beneficial use of the material. The loser, unfortunately, is the environment as millions more tons of coal ash needlessly wind up in landfills."

— Thomas H. Adams, executive director of the American Coal Ash Association

**ABOUT COAL ASH BENEFICIAL USE**

Almost half of America’s electricity is generated by burning coal. Generating that much electricity produces large volumes of coal ash — the generic term for several solid materials left over from the combustion process.

"Science tells a different story. Coal ash does not qualify as a ‘hazardous waste’ based on its toxicity. The trace levels of metals in coal ash are similar to the levels of metals in the materials coal ash replaces when it is recycled. But well-funded groups are spending millions of dollars to brand the material as ‘toxic’ and the effects of this short-sighted campaign are beginning to show in the reduction of environmentally beneficial recycling."
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Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) 

Gypsum remained the second highest used CCP when compared to fly ash when both totals are compared. Approximately 48.6 percent of the estimated 22 million tons produced, or 10.7 million tons, were used for beneficial purposes. The ongoing economic stagnation has resulted in fewer gypsum panel products produced and consumed in 2010. Because of the increase of installed flue gas desulfurization emission control systems, production numbers were 4 million tons higher than in 2009 and this upward trend should continue for several more years.

Bottom Ash utilization was 7.5 million tons or 42.3 percent of the total 17.8 million tons produced. This is a modest increase over 2009, mainly due to more actual data received this year. Bottom ash was primarily used in structural fills, concrete and concrete products, road base, raw feed for portland cement clinker, aggregates, mining applications and snow and ice control.

Production of FBC Ash reported in 2010 was 10.2 million tons as compared to 12.5 million tons in 2009, almost all of which was produced by independent power producers located in Pennsylvania (ARIPPA). The majority of this ash is used in mine reclamation activities (re-contouring, treatment of acid mine drainage, and land restoration). The drop in production reflects the lower generation rates of these independent power producers. The utilization rate for FBC ash is reported as 85 percent in 2010 as compared to nearly 94 percent in 2009.

Boiler Slag, although produced in relatively small numbers (2.3 million tons in 2010), reported the second highest use percentage among regularly reported categories. Nearly 61 percent of boiler slag produced is used for applications such as blasting grit, roofing granules, aggregates and snow and ice control. The availability of boiler slag is predicted to be reduced as more and more cyclone and slag-tap boiler units are retired.
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Founded in 1989, Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc. (CEC) has 20 years of experience assisting energy clients with coal combustion product (CCP) management projects. We integrate our company’s core practices and expertise in the areas of environmental and ecological services, civil / site development, waste management and water resources into all our CCP management solutions. Our clients receive a streamlined approach to engineering and permitting CCP projects which take into consideration the management of risk, addresses regulatory obligations, and minimizes bottom-line costs. Our CCP Management Services include:

- Disposal alternatives / feasibility and fatal flaw analysis
- Facility siting studies and environmental permitting
- Hydrogeologic / geotechnical site investigations and analysis
- Groundwater modeling and human health risk evaluation
- Ecological / cultural resource assessments and mitigation
- Surface water management / permitting / NPDES
- Dams / impoundments and ash pond design / closures
- Landfill / CCP management facility design
- CCP structural fills / mine disposal / reclamation strategies
- Construction / operation support services
- CCP and FGD by-product beneficial reuse strategies
- Public involvement / awareness issues

If you are looking for professional services in support of your next CCP management project or overall CCP management program, please contact Steven Putrich, PE at sputrich@cecinc.com, 330-310-6800.
More than three years after the failure of a coal ash disposal pond in Tennessee prompted a newly seated U.S. Environmental Protection Agency administrator to launch a reassessment of disposal regulations, the debate over those regulations continues full force. Buried throughout the millions of pages of regulatory rule-making documents and an expanding legislative record is an often overlooked, but critically important fact: At its core, the debate is more about who will enforce new regulations than what those regulations will look like.

At stake is the future of beneficial use of Coal Combustion Products. An overwhelming number of organizations agree that one potential regulatory approach – designating ash bound for disposal as “hazardous waste” – would create disastrous unintended consequences for beneficial use. EPA’s rulemaking activity also shows signs of expanding beyond creating disposal regulations to include redefining core concepts of what beneficial use is. Finally, the increasingly protracted debate has created regulatory uncertainty that is already beginning to affect beneficial use practices. (See related story in this issue: “Coal Ash Beneficial Use Rates Decline As Regulatory Uncertainty and ‘Toxic’ Publicity Continue.”)

**FIRST ONE REGULATORY PROPOSAL, THEN TWO, NOW THREE…**

Today there are three potential frameworks for future coal ash disposal regulation. To understand how the proposals relate to each other, it is helpful to consider how they emerged chronologically.

Discussion of coal ash regulation is nothing new in the United States. The EPA has studied the topic for decades under both Democrat and Republican
Outcome Will Determine Course of Ash Use and Disposal for Decades to Come

Figure 1

Coal Ash Regulatory History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Congress enacts the “Bevill Amendment” to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, instructing EPA to “conduct a detailed and comprehensive study and submit a report” to Congress on the “adverse effects on human health and the environment, if any, of the disposal and utilization” of coal ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>EPA issues Report to Congress concluding coal ash does not warrant “hazardous waste” regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>EPA issues Regulatory Determination that coal ash “hazardous waste” regulation is “not warranted”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>EPA issues second Report to Congress concluding coal ash does not warrant “hazardous waste” regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>EPA issues Final Regulatory Determination concluding coal ash materials “do not warrant regulation [as hazardous waste] ” and that “the regulatory infrastructure is generally in place at the state level to ensure adequate management of these wastes”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

administrations. (Figure 1 shows key dates in that chronology.) Those studies consistently concluded that coal ash does not warrant “hazardous waste” regulation.

Following EPA’s 2000 Final Regulatory Determination, the federal EPA was expected to develop coal ash disposal guidelines that could be applied by state environmental regulators without a “hazardous waste” designation. That activity was never completed, however, and on December 22, 2008, the dam broke. Literally.

The failure of an ash disposal pond at the Kingston Power Plant in Tennessee touched off a media firestorm and was a topic at EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson’s Senate confirmation hearing a month later. At that hearing, the incoming
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Administrator pledged to propose new coal ash regulations by the end of 2009.

As the EPA began to draft regulations, it quickly became apparent that there was movement within the Agency to rescind the 2000 Final Regulatory Determination and propose regulations under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Subtitle C is the section governing “hazardous waste.” This first proposal was immediately and forcefully opposed by a large and diverse coalition that was concerned about the cost and lack of scientific justification for such an approach, as well as its potential unintended consequences on beneficial use.

When EPA’s proposed regulation was submitted to other federal agencies for their required review, the process bogged down for several months. Documents revealed later showed that every other federal agency reviewing the proposed rule had serious concerns about the Subtitle C approach. Responding to those concerns, EPA added a second regulatory approach – this one under the “non-hazardous” Subtitle D of RCRA.

In June 2010, EPA finally released its Proposed Rule for coal ash disposal, but it really wasn’t a Proposed Rule in the traditional sense. Instead it sought public comments on two different potential approaches to disposal regulation and also asked for comment on a variety of seemingly unrelated matters pertaining to beneficial use. The ensuing public comment period generated an unprecedented response. By EPA’s account, more than 1,400 individuals testified at eight public hearings and more than 450,000 written comments were submitted. Of the written comments, EPA says over 13,000 (comprising over 2 million pages) contain “unique content requiring analysis.”
EPA won't say when it thinks that analysis will be complete. Since the close of the initial public comment period in November 2010, there has been a second comment period pertaining to additional data that has been added to the rulemaking record. Now there are rumors of a third comment period for still more data to be forthcoming and EPA has acknowledged that it is also performing beneficial use risk evaluations that it would like to complete before proposing a Final Rule.

Most EPA-watchers speculate that a proposed Final Rule won't come any earlier than 2013.

As EPA’s rulemaking process becomes increasingly protracted, Congress has stepped in with a third proposal for coal ash disposal regulation. The bill requires state-administered permit programs to create enforceable requirements for groundwater monitoring, lining of landfills, corrective action when environmental damage occurs and structural criteria. It also provides that if a state is unable or unwilling to implement the permit program, the federal EPA would have authority to do so.

The coal residuals bill passed the U.S. House of Representatives with bipartisan support in October 2011 and in April 2012 was incorporated into the House’s larger transportation reauthorization bill. The coal residuals bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate by 10 bipartisan co-sponsors and discussions regarding Senate passage of the bill are continuing.

**COMPARING THE PROPOSALS**

Figure 2 shows the key features of EPA’s two proposals and the Congressional bill. Note that the actual landfill design requirements are highly similar in all three bills. You don’t get a better landfill by labeling coal ash “hazardous waste.”
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There’s a good reason why there are few engineering differences in the three proposals. Despite a relentless assault by anti-coal environmental activists working to brand coal ash as “toxic,” (See related story in the 2011 Issue 1 edition of Ash at Work: “Coal Ash in Context: Separating Science from Sound Bites as Regulatory and News Media Debates Continue,”) even EPA agrees that Subtitle D non-hazardous landfill engineering standards would be protective of human health and the environment if applied to coal ash.

EPA never makes a claim that coal ash is “hazardous” based on its toxicity. Rather, the Agency’s “hazardous” proposal is based on the premise that hazard results from failures of disposal facilities. (Many of these failures, also known as “damage cases,” are disputed.) If EPA felt the material itself was truly toxic, Agency officials would be proposing hazardous waste landfill construction standards involving multiple redundant liners and leachate collection systems. They’re not.

Where you do see differences in the three proposals is in enforcement authority and time required to implement. Here is where it becomes clear that EPA wants direct federal enforcement authority and because of the way RCRA is written, a “hazardous waste” designation is the only way the Agency can get it. (It’s also clear that by doggedly pursuing the Subtitle C approach, EPA has pushed implementation of improved landfill standards many years into the future by virtue of the protracted rulemaking process and much longer implementation timeline if a Subtitle C rule were ever adopted.)

THE CASE FOR STATE OVERSIGHT
The much discussed and obvious disadvantage of direct federal enforcement is the collateral damage a “hazardous waste” designation would have on coal ash beneficial use. But there are many additional reasons for supporting a strong regulatory
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LANDFILLING VS. RECYCLING

Responsible Structural Fill Strategies Provide Superior Environmental Protection

By Christopher D. Hardin, P.E.

In its Proposed Ruling on CCRs (Proposed Rule), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) indicates that there are concerns with the disposal and reuse of some coal combustion residuals (CCRs) in unlined landfills, non-encapsulated structural fill and mine reclamation applications. The EPA notes that these concerns are exacerbated when acceptable engineering standards and controls are absent. The purpose of this article is to review a Subtitle D lined landfill approach for coal ash disposal, and how the system uses design controls to protect groundwater beneath a site. In addition, the following sections stress the importance of the coal combustion utilities and the CCR recycling industry continuing to employ best practices to preserve strategic beneficial reuse opportunities.

COAL ASH DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING

The disposal option for coal ash that has been recommended by many in the coal combustion utility and CCP reuse industries is a single composite liner with a leachate collection system. This option has been labeled Subtitle D Prime by the industry and is similar to the approach used for Subtitle D lined, municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills. The Subtitle D MSW landfill regulation has more than a 20 year track record of successfully managing an average of over 200 million tons of MSW per year. Subtitle D for MSW is an EPA mandated, and State managed program that was phased in over a 10 year period in the 1980s and 1990s. It typically requires synthetic liners, an extensive groundwater monitoring network, and collection and treatment of the leachate. A cross section of a typical Subtitle D single composite liner system is provided in Figure A.

Subtitle D lined landfills for containing contamination and protecting groundwater resources from the potential hazards of MSW have a successful track record. When an MSW landfill is lined with a composite liner of HDPE and low permeability soil, and a leachate collection system there is very low probability, if any, that groundwater will be impacted. A typical Subtitle D liner system is designed to contain contaminants and heavy metals in MSW that are frequently more problematic than the constituents found in coal ash.

Recognizing that many coal ash landfills and impoundments have performed effectively for years without the use of synthetic liners or leachate collection systems, industry representatives developed the term “Subtitle D Prime” to allow alternative liners and containment systems for CCPs. Subtitle D Prime would still allow the EPA to establish a robust environmental program for coal ash disposal units, but without crippling the CCP beneficial use and recycling industry. The Subtitle D Prime solution, as suggested by the Utilities Solid Waste Activities Group (USWAG) and American Public Power Association (APPA), also recommends that the closure time frame for existing CCR disposal units be phased in over a much longer time period than the
180 day period in the Proposed Rule. The approach in Subtitle D Prime is consistent with the flexibility and time frame that was used when Subtitle D was applied to existing solid waste landfills in the 1980s and 1990s. One of the main reasons for this flexibility would be to allow local county governments and the general public time to adjust to the cost of increasing regulation.

As most experienced solid waste design engineers are aware, the individual parts of a Subtitle D liner system can or will malfunction at times without causing any impact to the surrounding environment. The reason a Subtitle D liner system works is simple – REDUNDANCY in the system. The multiple systems of liners, leachate collection, and runoff and runon controls work because they have been designed as a coordinated system with each of the components having clear performance guidelines. In addition to the redundant liner and leachate collection systems, Subtitle D landfills have extensive groundwater monitoring and waste characterization requirements. All of these measures have resulted in a waste management approach that is respected and utilized not only in the United States, but worldwide.

**RECYCLING SHOULD COME FIRST**
An important aspect of handling any solid waste stream is to reduce, reuse and recycle where possible. The principle of emphasizing reduction, reuse and recycling is essential to the preservation of Greenfield space, and maximizing the airspace in any modern landfill. The Solid Waste Management Hierarchy as shown in Figure B depicts the importance of encouraging and protecting material reuse and recycling as the cornerstone of any waste management strategy. Currently, in the United States, 33.8 percent of MSW is recovered and recycled or composted, 11.9 percent is burned at combustion facilities, and the remaining 54.3 percent is disposed of in landfills. In 1980, the percentage being recovered and recycled was approximately 10 percent. It is noteworthy that it took over 25 years for the MSW recycling industry to develop, and the American public to make this shift to the current recycling rates for MSW. The CCP recycling industry has developed a much higher percentage of recycling in a shorter time period by working closely with industry, and developing safe and reliable methods for beneficial reuse.

By comparison, approximately 135 million tons of coal ash are generated every year in the United States. The percentage of recycling and reuse was 43 percent in 2009. The reuse and recycling of CCPs in 2009 was a combination of engineered structural fills, mine reclamation, concrete, brick and block. Since the initiation of the Proposed Rule, there has been a steady reduction in the volume of recycling of coal ash. Micro-encapsulated uses such as concrete block and cement remain acceptable methods for recycling CCPs, but continued concern about the potential ruling on the toxicity of coal ash caused temporary decreases in the use of CCPs in most other recycling methods. Most notably the reuse of CCPs in structural fills and roadways has decreased in the time period from 2007 to 2009 with most of these recyclable materials being sent to lined landfills.

Recently passed legislation in Congress, HR 2273 – “the Coal Ash Residuals Reuse and Management Act” would create a Federal coal ash disposal system that meets the requirements established by the EPA, but would still be managed by the States. It would be modeled after the successful implementation of the Subtitle D program for MSW that was phased in over a 10 to 15 year period. With a phased approach the States would still be required to submit their plan for a Subtitle D compliant coal ash management system that meets minimum EPA requirements. It is anticipated that phasing in of the requirements for CCP landfills and other lined options for coal ash would follow an approach similar to that used for the MSW rules. If the phased approach proposed in HR 2273 is used, then the impact to State regulatory agencies and the public caused by rapidly increasing costs for electric power would be minimized.

One thing that does not appear to be addressed in either the Proposed or pending bills in Congress is how to avoid the impact on the coal ash recycling industry. These impacts have come in form of lost jobs and the dismantling of a successful recycling industry that took many years to create. Without compromising a practical approach for protecting the environment there needs to be a way return coal ash recycling to its necessary and prominent position in the CCP waste management hierarchy.

**COMMON AND GENERALLY ACCEPTED METHODS FOR COAL ASH RECYCLING?**
In the Proposed Rule the EPA made it clear that it was not proposing to “change the May 2000 Regulatory Determination for beneficially used CCRs”, and that it was also not “proposing to address the placement of CCRs in mines, or non-minefill uses of CCRs at coal mine sites.” The focus of many sections in the Proposed Rule on CCRs was on controlling risks
associated with the improper placement of CCPs in structural fill applications. In the Proposed Rule on CCRs the EPA is soliciting comment and recommendations on what is necessary to continue using CCRs in structural fills and mine reclamation. Since structural fills and mine reclamation typically account for 16 to 43 percent of the total utilization of CCRs every year in the United States, it is essential that the meaningful input from coal combustion utilities and the CCR recycling industry are followed to preserve these important beneficial reuse opportunities.

Prior to 2009, approximately 43 percent of CCPs were recycled in a combination of concrete, engineered structural fills and encapsulated mine reclamation projects. Volume and placement information from 2007 to 2009 indicates that the volume of CCPs that would typically be recycled decreased by 10 to 30 percent. The value and importance of CCP recycling as an essential part of a coal ash management strategy suggests that this trend will cause significant problems if not addressed.

To begin to address these issues and develop guidelines the following is a list of several safe, effective and time-tested beneficial reuses of CCPs:

- Micro-encapsulated methods such as brick, concrete, block, flowable and a wide variety of cementitious products.
- Roadway base course placed over a compacted soil subgrade and/or as part of cementitious mixtures such as lime and CCPs.
- Shallow and deep structural fills of CCPs when placed as part of an engineered compaction program where moisture, density and drainage of the CCPs are controlled. Depending on the depth of fill the CCPs may be placed over a compacted, low permeability soil subgrade or a geomembrane liner.
- Macro-encapsulated methods for CCPs placement that utilize engineering and design of systems with geotextiles, geomembranes and geocomposite geonets.
- Macro-encapsulated methods including a low permeability, compacted soil subgrade located above the water table and beneath layers of compacted and moisture controlled CCPs. The finished CCP layer is then covered with a low permeability cover soil and vegetative topsoil layer.
- Micro-encapsulated methods for CCP reuse that involve additives such as lime, cement, and a wide variety of hydro-phobic admixtures.
- Roadway fills, engineered structural fills and mine reclamation with a minimum 2-foot separation from the groundwater table as described in HR 2273.

In addition to the general description of common and accepted CCP reuse methods provided above, many States have extensive and detailed beneficial reuse programs for CCPs that have been safely used without problems for many years. As it stands right now, many of these successful programs have been put "on hold" as the uncertainty with the Proposed Rule on CCRs is worked out.

**IMPACTS OF NOT RECYCLING COAL ASH?**

As mentioned in previous sections, many of the safe and effective methods that were previously utilized by coal ash recycling and reuse companies have been eliminated in the past two years. So where is this displaced volume of coal ash being stored, and what is the potential impact on the environment? Conservative estimates indicate that 2 to 10 million tons have been routed away from CCP recycling and to waste disposal over the past two years. From a solid waste management perspective, one of the most important principles for environmentally safe and cost effective waste management is making an effort to NEVER HANDLE any waste or recycle material TWICE. Once a waste or recycle material reaches its final destination it always takes additional energy to get it to the next stage. In addition to added energy cost there are potential impacts to environment when any solid waste material is re-excavated and transported to a new disposal or recycling facility. The same is true for coal ash as it is MSW or any industrial waste material.

A review of the CCP reuse and recycling industry information for the past 3 years indicates the following trends as the uncertainty over regulatory issues persists:

- Substantial volumes of coal ash that could have been recycled have been placed in the new lined, CCP landfills. Conservative estimates indicate the volume of re-routed and recyclable CCPs is in the range of 2 to 10 million tons over the past 2 years.
- More landfills and filled up new landfills means more impact to open space and valuable natural resources such as sand and gravel.
- It is conservatively estimated that approximately 10 percent or 10 million
tons of the coal ash has been re-routed away from construction fill materials and/or concrete the past 2 years. These changes result in:

• 400,000 tons of additional greenhouse gases, per year.

• Over $50 million in additional energy costs, per year.

• Over 100 million gallons of additional water used for cement production or natural resources mining, per year.

• Corresponding increases in the volume of valuable natural resources used for leachate collection systems and as a replacement for CCPs not being used in engineered structural fills.

• Additional transportation costs and the resulting increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the burning of fossil fuels in hauling trucks and construction equipment.

In addition to the impact on the natural resources and the environment, not being able to recycle coal ash is impacting the CCP recycling industry. The confusion over what constitutes safe and effective recycling of CCPs has even impacted the EPA’s Reduce, Reuse and Recycle Program. The recycling of non-hazardous industrial waste is an essential part of the EPA Reduce, Reuse and Recycle Program. The EPA indicates that “Industrial non-hazardous wastes that can be recycled and reused are key to a successful resource conservation program.” Unfortunately, one of the largest volumes of recycled industrial waste in the US has been eliminated from the recycling system as the current regulatory uncertainty persists.

**HOW CAN COAL ASH BE SAFELY PUT BACK TO WORK?**

Many of the answers to this question are already provided in the EPA’s approach to the successful management and disposal of municipal solid waste as outlined in Subtitle D. Other answers for safe and effective use of CCPs are included on the EPA’s web page for the Reduce, Reuse and Recycle Program. The following is a list of suggested interim measures for getting coal ash back into the industrial waste recycling system:

- **Interim Measure No. 1:** Allow for the placement of CCPs in coal and mineral mine reclamation sites using the existing State and Federal guidelines for engineering design, environmental remediation, and groundwater protection. The US has over 1 million acres of non-reclaimed coal and mineral mines that could easily and safely be remediated with a combination of properly placed and compacted FGD and coal ash. The regulatory programs for this type of mine reclamation with CCPs already exist.

- **Interim Measure No. 2:** Allow industries in States with a pre-existing beneficial reuse program for engineered structural fills and mine reclamation with CCPs to return to recycling CCPs if their program meets the groundwater separation guidelines described in HR 2273 and the Federal Standards required by the Clean Drinking Water Act.

- **Interim Measure No. 3:** Have EPA provide more clarity about what is meant by “sham beneficial reuse” and proper methods of waste disposal for CCPs, as well as the meaning of the terms encapsulated and unencapsulated uses of CCPs. For these definitions to have a clear and defendable scientific basis, it seems reasonable that they be developed in conjunction with experienced geochemists, and geotechnical and environmental engineers who have experience with the use and application of these terms in a wide variety of waste disposal applications.

In addition to the interim measures listed above, it seems prudent and within the EPA process to allow technical professionals on both sides of the issue to work out a few practical solutions. This may involve bringing together a national committee of respected technical professionals, from both sides of the debate, to develop practical solutions for CCP storage, disposal and recycling. Among the technical professionals there appears to be substantial agreement on what constitutes safe and effective methods for the disposal and recycling of CCPs. Of course there will always be exceptions that will require additional scrutiny and debate, but these should not keep things from moving forward on issues that are applicable to the majority of the coal ash containment sites. The practical points of the of agreement for CCP disposal and recycling can be applied now, as more of the more challenging issues surrounding coal combustion energy production are addressed.

In closing, it seems that developing a few interim solutions to remove some of the uncertainty surrounding key sections of the Proposed Rule could be a great way to enhance recycling, ensure safe and effective disposal of CCPs. None of the interim measures listed above would limit the ability of the EPA to make a full and complete review of current practices that are mentioned in the Proposed Rule on CCRs. In fact, breaking down the complex array of technical issues into a few key categories, that could be studied and solved by technical professionals, would actually serve to provide a more thorough review and increased environmental protection.

Christopher D. Hardin, P.E. is a geotechnical and environmental engineer who serves the Coal Combustion Practice Leader for Haley & Aldrich. He has over 24 years in landfill design, sediment remediation, constructability reviews, innovative re-use of coal combustion byproducts, dredged containment facility management, groundwater treatment system design, and geo-synthetic applications.
In the wake of increasing federal, state, and environmental activist oversight and considering the potential for groundwater and surface water impacts often found at coal ash management sites, developing viable strategies for defeating citizen suits under Section 7002(a)(1)(B) of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (“RCRA”) are extremely important. 42 U.S.C.A § 6901 et seq. Generally, Section 7002(a)(1)(B) of RCRA provides a cause of action where contamination creates an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment. Specifically, the statute authorizes a citizen to bring a suit against “any person … who has or who is contributing to the past or present handling, storage, treatment, transportation, or disposal of any solid or hazardous waste which may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment.” 42 U.S.C.A § 6972(a)(1)(B).
Although coal ash is exempt from RCRA regulation as a hazardous waste, coal ash contamination may still give rise to a citizen suit under RCRA. This is because coal ash, if not beneficially used, can be characterized as a solid waste for purposes of RCRA, and a solid waste, like a hazardous waste, gives rise to a RCRA citizen suit if the waste may present or threatens to present an imminent and substantial endangerment to human health or the environment.

While at first blush the burden of bringing a citizen suit appears to be low, a plaintiff is not assured of winning the case just by presenting the court with evidence of contamination. First, the statute provides a prosecution bar against a citizen suit where EPA or the state is already involved. Second, the plaintiff must prove that the contamination causes an “imminent and substantial endangerment” and courts have held that the mere fact that contamination exists is insufficient to rise to the level of an “imminent and substantial endangerment.”

**Statutory Bars**

In the first type of defense, if EPA or the state is involved in addressing the contamination, the government’s involvement may bar the citizen suit entirely. Pursuant to the terms of the statute, a citizen may not pursue a RCRA citizen suit if (a) EPA has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a CERCLA Section 106 action or EPA or the state has filed a RCRA endangerment action; (b) EPA or the state is engaging in its own removal action under CERCLA Section 104; or (c) EPA or the state has incurred costs under CERCLA Section 104 to initiate a remedial investigation and feasibility study and is diligently proceeding with a remedial action. 42 U.S.C.A § 6972(b)(2)(B) & (C). Additionally, if a court or administrative order under CERCLA Section 106 or RCRA Section 7003 has been issued and a party is diligently complying with the order, then a RCRA citizen suit may be barred. *Id.*

For example, in *Miami-Dade County v. United States*, 345 F. Supp. 2d 1319 (S.D. Fla. 2004), the county brought a citizen suit against the federal government and sought an order requiring the federal government to clean-up vinyl chloride and other volatile organic compounds found in soil and groundwater at the Miami International Airport. *Id.* at 1330. The Court held, however, that the citizen suit was barred under Section 7002(b)(2)(B)(iii) because U.S. EPA had already completed a RI/FS on the property and implemented a remedial action for the site. *Id.* at 1354. See also *Hudson Riverkeeper Fund, Inc. v. Harbor at Hastings Assoc.*, 917 F. Supp. 251, 254-56 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (dismissing the RCRA citizen suit because the lawsuit was barred by the pending state court action).
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While the statutory bar is a powerful tool under the right set of facts, courts have generally interpreted provisions barring RCRA claims narrowly and allowed citizen suits to proceed. For example, a citizen suit is not barred where the federal or state enforcement action does not address the environmental conditions articulated in the citizen suit complaint. 

Sanchez v. Esso Standard Oil Company, 572 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2009). In Sanchez, the Court explained that “[f]or the government action to bar a citizen suit, the government action must seek ‘to require compliance with the standard, limitation, or order’ that the citizen alleges is violated.” Id. at 3. Therefore, a court may allow a citizen suit to proceed where the complaint addresses an additional constituent or environmental condition that was not addressed by the government’s remediation plan.

In addition, a citizen suit is often not barred if the site has been enrolled in a voluntary remediation program or if the site is subject to state administrative action. Hernandez v. Esso Standard Oil Co., 397 F. Supp. 2d, 272, 280 (D.P.R. 2009) (citizen suit not barred by state administrative action); City of Waukegan v. Arshed, 2009 WL 458621, *3 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 23, 2009) (citizen suit not barred by entry into a state voluntary clean-up program); Kara Holding Corp. v. Getty Petroleum Mktg., Inc., 67 F. Supp. 2d 302, 307 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (stating that “most courts” have held “that state administrative actions” do not bar a citizen suit).

Finally, in order for the statutory bars to be effective, the federal or state agency must be “diligently prosecuting” the remedial action. Hudson Riverkeeper Fund, Inc., 917 F. Supp. at 256. In other words, the remedial action must not be used as a placeholder simply to prevent a citizen suit from proceeding.

Because the statutory bars to a citizen suit are limited, it is important to assess the likelihood of being sued under the citizen suit provision before entering into any type of agreement or order with a federal or state agency. In situations where a RCRA citizen suit is imminent, the client may benefit from being sued by EPA or the state regulatory agency in order to bar the citizen suit.

**Mere Presence of Contamination is Insufficient**

In addition to the statutory bars to a citizen suit, courts have held that the mere presence of contamination is insufficient to demonstrate that an imminent and substantial endangerment exists. Defendants can therefore argue that although contamination is present on the property, there is no cause of action under Section 6972(a)(1)(B). Two cases illustrate this point.

In Foster v. United States, 922 F. Supp. 642 (D.D.C. 1996), the owner of a contaminated site brought suit against the defendants, arguing that the defendants’ prior uses of the property contributed to the presence of PCBs, PAHs, and TPHs on the site. The defendants argued that the contamination did not present an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment and the Court agreed. The Court granted summary judgment to the defendants because (1) the contamination was “located at depths greater than 10-15 feet below ground [and therefore] will not result in human exposure to soil contaminants through contacts, inhalation, or ingestion”; (2) there was no risk of groundwater contamination because the contamination was not “migrating and percolating through the soil”; and (3) the groundwater at the site was not used as drinking water or for any other purpose. Id. at 662. Thus, although the site was contaminated, plaintiff failed to establish liability under RCRA because the contamination did not give rise to an imminent and substantial endangerment.

In a similar case, Cordiano v. Metacon Gun Club, Inc., 575 F.3d 199 (2d Cir. 2009), plaintiffs alleged that the shot fired from a nearby shooting range presented an imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment because lead concentrations in some soil samples exceeded the state cleanup standards. The Court dismissed the claim because plaintiffs “failed to adduce sufficient evidence on either of two issues: (1) the likelihood that existing lead contamination will in fact result in harm to human health or the environment; and (2) the severity of any harm that might occur.” Id. at 211. The Court made this determination in part because showing that the levels of contamination...
on the property exceeded state environmental standards was insufficient to establish liability under the RCRA citizen suit, and plaintiffs needed to provide more evidence regarding why the elevated levels of lead cause a “reasonable prospect of future harm that is both near-term and… potentially serious.” Id. at 212 (quotations and internal citations omitted). Rather, plaintiffs did not provide any evidence that “anyone is subject to long-term exposure to lead contamination at the [] site, or that there are realistic pathways of exposure there.” Id. at 213. As a result, the Court dismissed the RCRA citizen suit because the evidence did not “indicate anything more than a speculative prospect of future harm” and did not “include sufficient information from which a reasonable jury could find that the potential harm at issue rises to the level of a serious endangerment.” Id. at 214.

Plaintiffs’ obligation to prove that harm or a threat is imminent can provide fruitful defense opportunities. As illustrated by the cases above, at a bare minimum, plaintiffs must demonstrate to a court that an actual risk of harm threatens to occur immediately. The mere presence of contamination is insufficient to establish the requisite imminent endangerment or threat, and claims where contamination is present can fail under a variety of factual circumstances.

The owner or operator of a coal ash site must remain cognizant of the defense strategies available should there be a threat or the actual filing of a citizen suit. For example, if EPA or the state government is involved in diligently following a remedial action plan on the property, the citizen suit may be barred by the prosecution bars provided in the statute. Furthermore, a plaintiff cannot prevail unless he or she can establish that harm or endangerment to health or the environment is imminent.

Joshua R. More, Partner in Schiff Hardin LLP’s Environmental Law Group, regularly advises clients on the management of coal combustion by-products and may be reached at 312-258-5769 or jmore@schiffhardin.com.

Ashley L. Thompson, Associate in Schiff Hardin LLP’s Environmental Law Group, regularly advises clients on environmental litigation and compliance matters and may be reached at 312-258-5776 or athompson@schiffhardin.com.

The speculative prospect of future harm does not carry much weight.

Joshua R. More, Partner in Schiff Hardin LLP’s Environmental Law Group, regularly advises clients on the management of coal combustion by-products and may be reached at 312-258-5769 or jmore@schiffhardin.com.

Ashley L. Thompson, Associate in Schiff Hardin LLP’s Environmental Law Group, regularly advises clients on environmental litigation and compliance matters and may be reached at 312-258-5776 or athompson@schiffhardin.com.
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ISO-Veyor

Sustainable transport of CCP's for the cement industry

InBulk’s ISO-Veyors save time and money in the transportation, storage and distribution of blended cements and related minerals, providing an economical platform for sustainable development.

Blended cements have grown in popularity for both technical and economic reasons. The high amount of energy and CO₂ produced in manufacturing and transporting cement, means the industry must take steps to reduce the impact on the environment. Transportation is a key area where costs and emissions can be reduced, through intermodal strategies for distribution. With road congestion, global trade and fuel costs on the increase; there is an economic and environmental challenge to be faced.

Patented and built by InBulk Technologies, ISO-Veyors are versatile, intermodal containers for effective transportation, storage and horizontal discharge of Dry Bulk Materials (without need for tipping). Available in a range of configurations, specifications, sizes and materials, they’re ideal for all types of cement and CCP’s.

The ISO-Veyor has a highly impressive technical specification. Available in mild steel, stainless steel or aluminium, it is also available in either 20ft or 30ft configurations.

ISO-Veyors are discharged by standard 2-barg air supply. They can be used in conjunction with a variety of intermodal infrastructure commonly used for box containers, including Intermodal Transfer Points, Rail Ports, Reach Stackers, Side Lifting Trailers and Cranes.

For more information, visit inbulktechnologies.com
Intermodal Solution

The future proofed intermodal solution
As the transportation landscape evolves, and the demands of projects change, the ISO-Veyor provides a flexible, cost effective solution.

Road Transportation
The ISO-Veyor can be placed on a skeletal trailer and deployed as a powder road tanker. This combination provides an equivalent to road tankers at a significant cost advantage, with no loss in performance and a small payload difference. Customers utilising ISO-Veyors benefit from driver controlled deliveries, and are able to drop or switch loads without queuing for discharge slots. There’s also no requirement for expensive tipping chassis, as ISO-Veyors discharge from a horizontal position.

Rail Transportation
The ISO-Veyor can be placed on a rail car and used in the same way as a powder rail tanker. This delivers great rail economics with all the flexibility of Just-In-Time road deliveries, allowing suppliers, end-users and rail operating companies new opportunities for intermodal rail freight supply.

Sea Transportation
ISO-Veyors are ideally suited for either short or deep sea shipping, in the same way as standard box containers. This allows customers to increase their export reach and widen their geographical radius of supply. ISO-Veyors can be stacked on either container ships or barges.

Benefits

Ground Storage
Used on the ground, the ISO-Veyor becomes a ready-made weatherproof silo, for storage of cement blends to be used for construction or precast projects. This helps to avoid multiple handling and cuts investment in new silo capacity.

Cost Benefits
ISO-Veyors provide the functionality of dedicated powder road or rail tankers – without the expense. Dedicated modal solutions require storage silos to receive the material at either end of the transport chain. ISO-Veyors remove this requirement. Product integrity is ensured as the material itself is not handled until discharge into the final process.

Intermodal Benefits
ISO-Veyors are easy to fill, discharge, and handle. Deliveries of Dry Bulk materials are safe, efficient and secure, as there’s no requirement to transfer the material from one modal container to another.

Environmental Benefits
The ISO-Veyor is a closed, sealed system resulting in zero opportunity for pollution or spillage of material during transfers. There’s also a greatly reduced chance of accidental discharge into waterways, the atmosphere or other sensitive areas. The balancing of loads between road, rail and sea has a significant effect on air pollution and provides little opportunity for contamination.

Flexibility
ISO-Veyors can be utilised in any transport and storage setting. They offer strategic flexibility as the transportation landscape evolves and projects change.

Safety
As ISO-Veyors can be discharged in a horizontal position, without the need for tipping, this leads to a reduced risk of accidents and represents a major improvement to the safety of on-site deliveries.

Case Study

ISO-Veyors play a crucial part in building the world’s longest railway tunnel
When Holcim cement required a special intermodal solution for the transport of cement and binders to remote construction sites, they turned to InBulk’s ISO-Veyor for the solution.

Sedrun is a remote holiday town in the heart of the Swiss Alps. It’s also the location used to provide materials for the construction of the world’s longest railway tunnel. From Sedrun, a supply line runs 800m into the mountain, then a further 800m down. This brings material to the midpoint of the new Gotthard rail link, which will be a staggering 57KM in length when completed in 2016.

The Sedrun site is rail connected via a narrow gauge mountain railway, which carries the ongoing materials needed to build the tunnel. InBulk Technologies are currently supplying PFA ash to the site with a number of 20ft ISO-Veyors carried on small 20ft intermodal flat wagons.

The project highlights just how versatile InBulk’s ISO-Veyors can be in serving the most difficult and remote customer locations, giving quality logistics solutions, tailored to the most demanding situations.

Contact

Make a move to sustainable transportation
ISO-Veyors are available to purchase or rent and can also be supplied as part of a comprehensive logistics package.

For more information, visit
www.InterBulkGroup.com
enquiries@inbulktechnologies.com

InBulk TECHNOLOGIES
Reducing the amount of portland cement used in construction has important environmental benefits in terms of both the energy used to manufacture the cement as well as in lower CO₂ emissions and embodied energy in the assemblage. These considerations can have economic benefits to concrete producers, masonry contractors, masonry and paver producers and stakeholders in the masonry industry.

To improve the sustainability of concrete masonry construction, research was conducted by the California Masonry Association of California and Nevada (CMACN) to determine the viability of replacing up to 60 percent of the portland cement in masonry grout with recycled materials like coal fly ash. Various combinations of Class F Fly Ash, portland cement and standard concrete materials were evaluated for performance, sustainable benefits and practicality. Headwaters Resources contributed time and materials to the study.

Concrete masonry using high volume fly ash grout has many enhanced sustainable benefits incorporating green design and structural integrity, including:

- The incorporation of high fly ash contents can greatly reduce the Embodied Energy in a masonry wall unit. (Portland cement contributes 90 percent to 95 percent of the Embodied Energy in masonry construction, depending on the cement content.) The manufacturing of portland cement produces approximately one ton of CO₂ released into the atmosphere for every ton of portland cement produced. Utilizing fly ash at high replacement levels reduces the carbon footprint of a masonry unit.
- Durability and low maintenance requirements with reduced permeability and porosity.
- Lower moisture transmission through wall unit and a longer life cycle because of the impervious improvement of the cementitious matrix.
- Structural capacity as designed (ability to withstand earthquake and high wind events, severe weather).
- Inhibits efflorescence of the masonry assemblage.
- These same qualities can also be applied to all grouts and concrete used in Insulated Concrete Form (ICF) building systems.
• Fly ash is the largest volume recycled material in the country and inclusion at high replacement levels increases concrete masonry construction sustainability. (See Citizens for Recycling website at www.recyclingfirst.org and www.whymasonry.org for more information)

• High volume fly ash grout is an excellent choice for DOT sound-wall construction because of its superior pumping and reconsolidation characteristic.

• Use of high volume fly ash grout contributes to obtaining credits in the USGBC LEED certification and other green building programs.

PERFORMANCE BENEFITS OF INCLUDING FLY ASH IN GROUT

Remember, fly ash is a spherical material that acts as a lubricant in concrete mixes, especially grouts. Even though a significant portion of the mix water can be reduced in a high volume fly ash grout mix, care and caution must be exercised to keep an adequate amount of water in the grout mix so that the normal absorption process from the grout to the concrete masonry unit can occur. (See ASTM C-476) Typical high-water, high cement grouts exhibit dramatic shrinkage between the inner shell of the masonry unit and the grout as concrete hydrates in the cell. High volume fly ash grout uses less water for the same or higher slump and can minimize this shrinkage and increase the bond and shear strength between the grout and the masonry unit.

Reducing the amount of portland cement in grouts can be especially significant in high seismic regions. Because of the stringent structural requirements due to high seismic risk, concrete masonry walls are typically fully grouted, resulting in about half of the wall's volume being grout. It is estimated that over 1.3 million tons of portland cement are used annually in the production of grout for concrete masonry walls in California and Nevada. National numbers are much higher for other states. Replacing a substantial percentage of portland cement with recycled materials such as fly ash represents a significant potential to reduce CO₂ emissions associated with concrete masonry construction, creating a “greener” product and image for the masonry industry while enhancing the integrity of the masonry assemblage at the same time.
Fly ash has been used as a cement replacement in portland cement concrete for over 80 years. In concrete products, fly ash moderates the rate of compressive strength gain and in high volumes acts as a plasticizer because of its shape, so it improves the workability, flowability, pumpability and placement of the plastic grout. Replacement of up to 20 percent to 30 percent (typically by weight) of portland cement by Class F fly ash is currently a common practice in most concrete and 40 to 50 percent is being accepted in grout mix designs across the country.

Efflorescence, occurs when calcium hydroxide (free lime), a water soluble by-product of the hydration process of portland cement, is carried to the surface of cement-based products by migrating water. Fly ash combines with this free lime to produce durable components within the concrete matrix, reducing the amount of free lime migrating to the masonry surface. Exposed to the atmosphere, calcium hydroxide reacts with carbon dioxide to form calcium carbonate deposits which remain apparent as unsightly, whitish stains. Too often, efflorescence shows up to severely degrade the aesthetic appeal of otherwise successful masonry projects.

“Fly ash has been used as a cement replacement in portland cement concrete for over 80 years.”
The NEXT GENERATION

..............in FLY ASH BENEFECIATION

CARBON BLOCKER™

✓ PROVEN and PATENTED Technology approved for use by many State DOT agencies
✓ EXTENSIVE field experience since 2005
✓ HIGHLY EFFECTIVE on POWDERED ACTIVATED CARBON
✓ Minimal CAPITAL costs and no plant interruption

Contact FlyAshDirect’s Concrete Research Laboratory to schedule a FREE comprehensive analysis of your ash. The proof is in the results.

FlyAshDirect
866-871-9733
www.flyashdirect.com

In partnership with:
BASF
The Chemical Company
TESTING OF HIGH VOLUME FLY ASH GROUTS

Typical grout mix designs tested were code compliant and were in the range of the following proportions:

Design Strength 2000 – 2500 @ 28 Days – range of strength is appropriate for most grout mix designs ASTM C-476, Section 4.2.1.2

Water/Cement Ratio 0.69 – most grouts need to be at 0.60 or higher for proper placement ASTM C-476 Section 4.2.1.2 and ACI 530.1-11

Required Slump 9” (+ or – 1”) – slump can be as high as 11 inches in high volume fly ash grout mixes

Cement (Type II/V) 338.4# – 60 percent or less – can be as low as 40 percent in certain applications

Fly Ash (Class F) 225.6 # – 40 percent – can be as high as 60 percent in certain applications

Fresh Water 47.00 Gallons (391#) – proper water content is necessary for absorption and slump control

Washed Concrete Sand 1735# – 62 percent – can be as low as 55 percent

3/8” Pea Gravel 1072# – 38 percent – can be as high as 45 percent

Stakeholder results from the tests are interesting. Results show that grout utilizing high volume fly ash meets the minimum requirements of most building codes at 28 days (2,000 psi or higher) even with replacement of 50 percent of the portland cement with fly ash; and at between 42 and 56 days all mix designs with up to 50 percent replacement equaled or exceeded code: the 60 percent mix, while acceptable over time, had a slower strength gain and may be used in any non-structural application upon acceptance.

Recent research conducted by the CMACN, Masonry Institute of America and Brigham Young University has demonstrated that up to 50 percent of the portland cement in masonry grout can be replaced by fly ash in a properly designed mix to produce a grout that meets all current code requirements for strength, and produces a more sustainable and economic system. The BYU research also included the utilization of fly ash in all types of masonry mortars to measure its performance in that application.

MEASURED STRENGTH OF GROUTS WITH MODERATE TO HIGH SCM REPLACEMENT OF PORTLAND CEMENT (FLY ASH ONLY)

Testing (see chart) shows that grout mixes with 20 percent and 30 percent cement replacement had strengths similar to those of the conventional grout throughout the time period evaluated. The 40 percent and 50 percent fly ash replacement grouts gained strengths slower than the conventional mixes, but still met the code required minimum strength at both 28 and 42 days.

High SCM grouts are a viable high strength, structural, sustainable and economic alternative for concrete masonry construction and need to be considered during the submittal process. The compressive strength testing at 42 days (versus the typical 28 days) should not have a significant effect on the overall building project schedule. Prism testing in addition to grout specimen testing may be warranted when using high volume fly ash and SCM grouts in masonry construction.

ADDITIONAL CONCLUSIONS AND ADVANTAGES FOR CONCRETE PRODUCERS:

- Grouts with up to 30 percent (by weight) of portland cement replaced with Class F fly ash can be treated as conventional masonry grout. Significant material, water and cement savings can be realized.

- When 40 percent to 50 percent (by weight) of portland cement is replaced with Class F fly ash, the compressive strength should be tested and evaluated at 42 days rather than 28 days, although many high quality mixes meet the 28 day benchmark.

- Analyze the economies of higher coarse aggregate or lower fine aggregate proportions in high volume fly ash grouts using gradations and other properties to fine tune mix proportions.

- Recycled or reclaimed and alternative aggregates may be appropriate for these mixes.

- Do not over-use chemical admixture to obtain proper slump… fly ash at 40 percent plasticizes the concrete adequately. Many properly designed grout mixes use no chemical admixture.
Fly Ash Marketing
Engineering and Construction
Transportation/Logistics
Post Generation Recycling and Handling
STAR® Thermal Beneficiation
Grout strengths using high volume fly ash proportions are capable of achieving a wide strength range for structural application exceeding the “normal” grout requirements.

Cycle time for ready mix trucks and grout pumps is reduced due to ease of discharge, quicker pumping and placement on the job. Fly ash is a spherical material adding a lubricating effect. Grout mixes with high fly ash content exhibit extremely fluid pumping characteristics. Reconsolidation and vibration time and costs on the job are greatly reduced.

Sixty percent (by weight) replacement may be a viable grout alternative if the amount of displaced portland cement is a primary consideration.

Sample section of masonry wall with evidence of efflorescence and water intrusion. (SoCal 09)

Note the absence of efflorescence, water intrusion or aggressive chemical attack in this section of HVFA grouted wall. (SoCal 09)

“Concrete masonry using high volume fly ash grout has many enhanced sustainable benefits incorporating green design and structural integrity.”
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Marketing Fly Ash, Bottom Ash and Synthetic Gypsum for our Utility Partners

- The industry’s most extensive network of distribution and terminal assets
- Engineering, design, and construction services
- Total CCP Program Management
- Full spectrum of on-site ash handling operations
- State of the Art R&D Technology Center
- History of successful fly ash products development with in excess of 21 patents
- Quality Control/Quality Assurance
- Technical and customer service
- A leader in promoting the CCP industry

mrt-bd@cemex.com 1-800-99-CEMEX (23639)
When the American Coal Ash Association’s name was adopted in 1985 as the name of the nation’s leading advocate for utilization of “power plant ash,” it already had been operating for 17 years in tireless efforts to better promote understanding of recycling and beneficial use of fly ash, bottom ash and boiler slag, as well as many of the air emission scrubber materials. The National Ash Association was formally incorporated in Washington, DC on March 8, 1968.


This new recurring feature of Ash at Work will examine the early years of the National Ash Association (NAA) and issues and events that were part of the beneficial use industry’s defining years. “Ash Classics” will delve into our industry’s history and look at some innovations that came to fruition and some that didn’t. We may even discover that beneficial use back then and today are very similar, with the same sorts of challenges and opportunities, despite the difference in decades. We hope that you will enjoy this retrospective perspective of history, when one can learn by looking back as well anticipate by looking ahead.
In 1968, NAA published the first Ash at Work – a six-page, two-color newsletter that eventually grew into a number of specialized bulletins or articles, all under the banner of Ash at Work, but focused on selected issues. The primary author and editor of the new publication was Allan W. Babcock of West Virginia who, despite this important role, rarely stepped into the spotlight. He quietly worked behind the scenes gathering information and collecting photographs, never seeking recognition for his work. Al passed away in late 2010 and his extensive collection of historical NAA documents was donated to ACAA where they have become valuable as insights into the history of this organization.

Beginning in 1974, the newsletters were printed on recycled paper, an early step toward sustainability. The last of these Ash at Work publications was published by ACAA in September 1999, at which time it went dormant until resurrected as a full color magazine in 2004.

Headlines from early issues of Ash at Work included: "Flyash Brick Demonstrated," "Beneficiation Units Are Being Installed," "U.S. Ash Utilization is On the Increase," "Ash Used in Base and Paving..." and "New Fly Ash Concrete Masonry Block Introduced." NAA also published technical guidance and case studies on many topics. Topics included "Ashphalt; Turning Waste Material into Useful Aggregate," "Economics of Ash Utilization," "How Fly Ash Improves Concrete Block, Ready-Mix Concrete, Concrete Pipe" and "Fly Ash as a Structural Fill." The topics are as important today as they were in the 1970s.

NAA's Executive Director James Covey initiated an effort in 1982 to keep the membership informed of upcoming issues, and did this in part through a new publication "Ash in Action." It was an infrequently and undated printed update on activities in Washington, DC, especially those originating from federal offices.

In 1983, NAA was faced with the first efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to define certain materials as hazardous wastes under Section 3001 of the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA). Public hearings began in June 1983 and NAA was in the forefront. An "Ash Alert" was issued by the association urging members to participate in these hearings and work to help their business partners and others to understand the potential impact a hazardous definition could have on the costs of managing ash. A full page explanation titled "If this is ever termed 'Hazardous Waste,' a lot of you face big trouble" was widely distributed by NAA. At this time, the terminology was simply "ash" as coal combustion byproducts or residuals had not yet been used. Between 1983 and 1985, NAA submitted technical documents and reports to the EPA supporting how beneficial coal ash was in construction activities.

When the EPA issued the Report to Congress in February 1988, it stated, "The EPA has concluded that coal combustion waste steams generally do not exhibit hazardous characteristics under current RCRA regulations. EPA does not intend to regulate under subtitle C fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag and flue gas desulphurization wastes."

NAA's efforts, along with many other stakeholders, had provided sufficient data to help the EPA understand that CCPs
were (are) not hazardous and that they were of significant value. In that same report, the EPA further stated that were CCP waste disposal problems to arise, the EPA would use section 7003 of RCRA and sections 104 and 106 of CERCLA to address any threats or imminent hazards to human health and the environment.

As can been seen by this brief introduction, many of the issues first encountered and addressed by NAA, continue today. In future articles, we will learn more about NAA’s outreach and education activities as well as a few stories that may entertain.

“The primary author and editor of the new publication was Allan W. Babcock of West Virginia who, despite this important role, rarely stepped into the spotlight.”

A modern look at the WVU Coliseum – a 14,000-seat multi-purpose arena which is located in the Evansdale campus of West Virginia University. It was featured on the first Ash at Work in 1969.

Controlled Low Strength Material (CLSM) for public and private construction requirements

CLSM for ...
- Trench backfills and encasements of water & sewer distribution and collection systems
- Buried utilities: electric, telephone, cable, etc.
- Annular spaces
- Abandonments: piping/vaults/underground storage tanks and similar
- Foundation; bridge and structure backfilling
- Sub grade stabilization projects

Our patent pending technology provides a variety of set times, strengths and fluidity which allows for both flowing or pumping long distances. Is easy to excavate, displaces water and is self-leveling. Normal set times are within 30 minutes and asphalt ready within 90 minutes.

ROUTINE OR 24/7 EMERGENCY DELIVERY OF SINGLE TO CONTINUOUS POURS FROM SMALL JOBS UP TO THOUSANDS OF YARDS.

Contact Us: (303) 598-4130
Fax: (303) 292-1176
E-mail: Flashfill@QwestOffice.net
PO Box 16091, 4647 National Western Drive
Denver, CO 80216

A Network of Concrete Solutions

Toll Free: (888) 518-6424

ROMANO ASSOCIATES
Coal Combustion Product Management
Marketing • Sales • Distribution
- Project Development
- Beneficial Reuse
- Transportation Logistics
- Material Equipment Analysis
We offer a full range of coal combustion product services, material handling logistics, utilization, and facility design assistance.
With over 20 years of unparalleled expertise and experience in the field, our staff provides a network of environmentally sound and cost-effective solutions.

ROMANO ASSOCIATES
130 Woodbridge Avenue • Buffalo, New York 14214
Phone: (716) 837-5595 • Email: info@pjromano.com
www.pjromano.com

Feature
American Coal Ash Association members volunteered to staff the ACAA exhibit booth at this year’s Transportation Research Board meeting in Washington DC. The TRB Annual Meeting program covered all transportation modes, with more than 11,000 attendees, 4,000 presentations in nearly 650 sessions and workshops addressing topics of interest to policy makers, administrators, practitioners, researchers, and representatives of government, industry, and academic institutions.
**WINTER MEETING**
The American Coal Ash Association’s winter meeting in Tampa, Florida, attracted 180 attendees – the largest tally for any meeting in memory. Attendees were treated to a strong slate of speakers, including presentations by U.S. Congressman David McKinley and representatives of the Environmental Council of the States, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, Tennessee Valley Authority, Tampa Electric, Electric Power Research Institute, U.S. Agricultural Research Service and more.

United States Congressman David McKinley of West Virginia provided a keynote address. Rep. McKinley was the primary sponsor of the “Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act” which was approved by the U.S. House of Representatives last October and is now under consideration by the U.S. Senate.

**NEW ACAA OFFICE UP AND RUNNING**
Thanks to months of advance planning by American Coal Ash Association staff in Colorado, ACAA headquarters has now taken up residence in Michigan. The relocation was completed when ACAA’s Aurora, Colorado, lease terminated in February. The Michigan location, hosted by Creative Association Management, was selected last year after a volunteer member task team solicited bids, reviewed proposals and negotiated a management services contract that was approved by the ACAA Board of Directors. Alyssa Barto now provides the day to day member services previously handled by Annely Noble.

Front Row (left to right): Stacey Clement (Lead Accountant), Alyssa Barto (Member Liaison), Vicki Rogers (Event Planner).  
Back Row (left to right): Melinda Reynolds (Manager, Member Services), Renee Lewis (Director, Publishing & Event Services), Barry Bergin (Supervisor, Publishing Services), Ryan Jay (Graphic Designer).
Membership Gains/Losses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 ended with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 members.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Q1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Q2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Q3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Q4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 December 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 Members</td>
<td>2011 – Net gain of one member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is nothing more important to the American Coal Ash Association than its members, for without them ACAA would not have the staff or resources to advance the management and use of coal combustion products in ways that are environmentally responsible, technically sound, commercially competitive, and supportive of a sustainable global community.

Memorable events in the coal combustion products industry three years ago caused a landslide of ACAA member applications resulting in a 21 percent increase in the number of approved members to date since January 2009. The increase might have been even more dramatic had it not been for the loss of some existing members resulting from the EPA rulemaking uncertainty and economic tumult that have occurred since the EPA decided to potentially reconsider the classification of coal combustion products to “hazardous for disposal”.

Figure 1 shows the membership gains and losses during 2011. Although 2010 ended with 153 ACAA members and ACAA approved 18 additional new memberships, member losses resulted in a net gain of only one new member to a total of 154 by the end of 2011.

In exit interviews, departing member company points of contact gave several different reasons for allowing memberships to lapse:

- The member company found that its financial situation made cutting expenses necessary, but added that as soon as the ash utilization market improved, the company would rejoin ACAA;
- Individual members who had found employment in the industry dropped their memberships because they acquired membership access through new employers who belonged to ACAA;
- The member company decommissioned its coal combustion stations as a result of the age of the units, the cost to retrofit for new regulatory standards, or the EPA coal ash rulemaking uncertainty;
- In one instance, the company said that it had to change the thrust of its mission...
to remain viable in light of potential EPA rulemaking, and as a result, that ACAA's mission no longer fulfilled its new or different needs;

• Member companies are merging, which resulted in the loss of one utility member.

• Sadly, ACAA lost one individual membership due to the death of one of its members.

Dues income arrived slowly into the ACAA office in 2011. Although the bulk of companies paid their dues during the first quarter of the year, by the end of the third quarter there were still several companies remaining who were working on budgets (or grants) in order to allow them to pay their 2011 dues, something unprecedented in previous years. Some members had requested the ACAA quarterly dues payment option in order to alleviate cash flow issues.

ACAA noticed that those members who had not been active in Association meetings or EPA comment formulation were the members who either paid their dues very late or not at all. In order to benefit from the Association’s work, ACAA encourages member companies to remain engaged by attending and networking at meetings, participating in regularly scheduled teleconferences and committee work, requesting supporting materials from the ACAA office, reading The Phoenix and other e-news updates, and checking the ACAA website frequently.

Currently, ACAA’s membership is comprised of 42 Utilities (27.3 percent), 2 Non-utility Producers (1.3 percent), 16 Marketers (10.4 percent), 14 Specialty Marketers (9.1 percent), 67 Associates (43.5 percent), and 13 Individuals (8.4 percent). Of these members, ACAA has 62 members on the Board of Directors, which represents 40 percent of the membership. Figure 2 recognizes new members who joined ACAA during 2011.

ACAA welcomes its new members and notifies its existing members of these additions using three means of communication:

• Through an individual e-mailed announcement which is sent to all existing member companies and its employees, and which provides a profile of the new member company, downloadable Outlook contact information for the new primary and alternate points of contact, and a link to the new member’s website;

• Through an announcement in The Phoenix, ACAA’s monthly e-news publication sent to all members; and,

• With a post on the ACAA homepage of the new member’s company information as listed in the first bullet point above.

After ACAA has done its part in spreading the word, it counts on its existing members to welcome the new points of contact and to make business connections with them.

ACAA’s complimentary publication, Ash At Work, is a primary source of new membership due to its large readership of about 10,000, its abundance and quality of advertisers, and its impressive and timely industry articles and information. The ACAA website which provides up-to-date industry news including the latest on EPA’s forthcoming rulemaking is another significant source of member draw. Finally, our existing members are our best referrals! The American Coal Ash Association always welcomes suggestions from its members of potential businesses that would benefit from a member association with ACAA. A link to the membership application may be found on the ACAA homepage at www.acaa-usa.org.

ACAA Special Assistant Annely Noble can be reached at annely.noble@acaa-usa.org.
2012 American Coal Ash Association Membership Directory

These listings are organized into the following seven membership categories:
- Utility
- Marketer
- Speciality Marketer
- Associate
- Non-Utility
- Individual
- Honorary Members

Utility

Ameren Energy
1901 Chouteau Ave., MC611
St. Louis, MO  63103

Mark Bryant
Managing Executive
Phone: 314-554-2340
Fax: 314-206-1250
Email: mmbryant@ameren.com

American Electric Power
P.O. Box 16036, Arena Bldg, Floor 3
Columbus, OH  43216-0036

Richard Hayek
CCP and Gypsum Marketing
Phone: 614-583-7457
Fax: 614-583-1619
Email: rdhayek@aep.com

Aurora Energy, LLC
100 Cushman St., Ste. 210
Fairbanks, AK  99701

Buki Wright
President
Phone: 907-452-8767
Fax: 907-451-6543
Email: buki@usibelli.com

Illustration: Alexey Klementiev / Photos.com
Basin Electric Power Cooperative
1717 E. Interstate Ave.
Bismarck, ND  58503

Kevin Solie
Senior Water Quality/Waste Mgmt Coordinator
Phone: 701-557-5495
Email: ksolie@bepc.com

Colorado Springs Utilities
13545 Cooling Tower Rd., MC 41
Fountain, CO  80817

Brian Leach
Project Manager
Phone: 719-668-8965
Fax: 719-668-8977
Email: bleach@csu.org

Colstrip Energy Limited Partnership
1087 W. River St., #200
Boise, ID  83702

R. Lee Roberts
General Partner
Phone: 208-344-3570
Email: viellevigne@aol.com

Constellation Energy
1005 Brandon Shores Rd., FSRC 2nd Floor
Baltimore, MD  21226

Ann Couwenhoven
Manager, Coal Combustion Products
Phone: 410-787 5113
Email: ann.couwenhoven@constellation.com

Consumers Energy
1945 W. Parnall Rd., P26-303
Jackson, MI  49201

Willie Mills
Coal Combustion Products Manager
Phone: 517-788-1233
Fax: 517-788-0545
Email: wrmills@cmsenergy.com

Dairyland Power Cooperative
3251 East Ave. S., P.O. Box 817
La Crosse, WI  54602-0817

David Lesky
Lead Chemist
Phone: 608-787-1351
Fax: 608-787-1490
Email: dle@dairynet.com

Dominion
5000 Dominion Blvd.
Glen Allen, VA  23060

Dennis Slade
Environmental Consultant
Phone: 804-273-2658
Email: dennis.a.slade@dom.com

DTE Energy
St Clair PP-FS, 4901 Pointe Dr.
East China, MI  48054

Laurie Cook
Principal Market Engineer, CCPs
Phone: 810-326-6331
Fax: 810-326-6324
Email: cooakm@dteenergy.com

Duke Energy Corporation
526 S. Church St., P.O. Box 1006, MC EC10C
Charlotte, NC  28201-1006

Tony Mathis
Director, Byproducts, Fuels
& Materials Handling
Phone: 704-382-7721
Fax: 704-382-9843
Email: trmathis@duke-energy.com

Dynegy Midwest Generation, LLC
604 Pierce Blvd.
O'Fallen, IL  62269

James Nuernberger
Sr. Manager – Purchasing
Phone: 618-206-5841
Fax: 618-206-5891
Email: james.j.nuernberger@dynegy.com

FirstEnergy Corp.
76 South Main St.
Akron, OH  44308

Paul Kish
Senior Environmental Specialist
Phone: 330-761-4323
Fax: 330-315-9792
Email: kishp@firstenergycorp.com

GenOn Energy, Inc.
21200 Martinsburg Rd., MS 100MA
Dickerson, MD  20842

Patrick Miglio
Manager, CCPs
Phone: 202-365-6812
Email: patrick.miglio@genon.com

Great River Energy
1611 E. Century Ave., Ste 200
Bismarck, ND  58503

Al Christianson
Mgr, ND Business Development
Phone: 701-250-2164
Fax: 701-442-7864
Email: achristianson@grenergy.com

Indianapolis Power & Light Company
One Monument Circle, Rm 771
Indianapolis, IN  46204-2936

Dana Meier
Quality and Byproducts Manager
Phone: 317-261-8792
Fax: 317-630-3602
Email: dana.meier@aes.com

JEA
4433 William Ostner Rd.
Jacksonville, FL  32226

Scott Schultz
Director, Byproducts Services
Phone: 904-665-8126
Fax: 904-665-6951
Email: schusw@jea.com

Kansas City Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 418679
Kansas City, MO  64141-9679

Frederick Gustin PE
Manager, CCPs & Additives
Phone: 816-556-2108
Fax: 816-556-2047
Email: fred.gustin@kcpl.com

LG&E and KU Services Company
220 West Main St., 4th Floor
Louisville, KY  40202

Kenneth Tapp
Senior By-Products Coordinator
Phone: 502-627-3154
Fax: 502-627-3243
Email: kenny.tapp@lge-ku.com
Applications:
- CCB Landfills
- Coal Storage Pads
- Gypsum pads
- Ash Pile Covers
- Leachate Containment Ponds
- HDPE Leachate Collection Pipe

SAFETY – QUALITY – COMMITMENT
Providing High Quality Geosynthetics and Installation for the Power Industry
Lower Colorado River Authority
3700 Lake Austin Blvd.
Austin, TX  78703

Todd Davey CPSM
Senior Category Manager, Supply Mgmt
Phone: 512-473-3310
Fax: 512-473-4094
Email: todd.davey@lcra.org

Midwest Generation LLC
235 Remington Blvd., Ste A
Bolingbrook, IL  60440

Margaret Ruane
Senior Fuels and Transportation Specialist
Phone: 630-771-7883
Fax: 312-788-5480
Email: mruane@mwgen.com

Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.
400 North Fourth St.
Bismarck, ND  58501

Alan Welte
Manager of Generation
Phone: 701-222-7948
Email: alan.welte@mdu.com

Muscatine Power & Water
3205 Cedar St.
Muscatine, IA  52761-2204

Donald Pauken
Mgr, Environmental Affairs
Phone: 563-262-3394
Fax: 563-262-3315
Email: dpauken@mpw.org

Nebraska Public Power District
402 E. State Farm Rd. North
North Platte, NE  69101

Thomas Schroeder
Fossil Fuels Manager
Phone: 308-535-5327
Fax: 308-535-5333
Email: tjschro@nppd.com

Platte River Power Authority
2000 E. Horsetooth Rd.
Fort Collins, CO  80525

Jon Little
Marketing & Community Relations Mgr
Phone: 970-229-5352
Fax: 970-229-5244
Email: littlej@prpa.org

PPL Generation, LLC
Two North 9th St., GENPL6
Allentown, PA  18101-1179

Lawrence LaBuz
Manager, Coal Combustion Products
Phone: 610-774-5340
Fax: 610-774-4759
Email: lllabuz@pplweb.com

Progress Energy
100 East Davie St., TPP9A
Raleigh, NC  27601

Barbara Coppola
Manager Byproducts & Reagents
Phone: 919-546-6002
Fax: 919-546-2590
Email: barbara.coppola@pgnmail.com

PSEG Fossil, LLC
80 Park Plaza, T-25
Newark, NJ  07102

Donald Gaston
Director, Power Generation
Phone: 973-430-7491
Fax: 973-642-0765
Email: donald.gastonjr@pseg.com

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
780 N. Commercial St., P.O. Box 330
Manchester, NH  03105-0330

Allan Palmer
Senior Engineer
Phone: 603-634-2439
Fax: 603-634-3283
Email: palmeag@nu.com

Santee Cooper
1 Riverwood Dr., P.O. Box 2946101
Moncks Corner, SC  29461-2901

Thomas Edens
Administrator, Combustion Product Utilization
Phone: 843-761-8000
Fax: 843-761-4156
Email: thomas.edens@santeecooper.com

South Carolina Electric & Gas
220 Operation Way
Cayce, SC  29033-3701

Suzette Mangan-Bryson
Engineer, Byproduct Utilization
Phone: 803-217-6321
Fax: 803-933-8002
Email: smangan-bryson@scana.com

Southern Company Generation
600 18th St., N., Bin 14N-8162, P.O. Box 2641
Birmingham, AL  35203

Hollis Walker
CCP Manager
Phone: 205-257-5311
Fax: 205-257-5765
Email: hwwalker@southernco.com

Southern Illinois Power Cooperative
11543 Lake of Egypt Rd.
Marion, IL  62959

Leonard Hopkins
Fuel and Compliance Manager
Phone: 618-964-1448 x 268
Fax: 618-964-1867
Email: lhopkins@sipower.org

Sunflower Electric Power Corporation
2440 Holcomb Lane/P.O. Box 430
Holcomb, KS  67851

Paul Reynolds
Mgr, Generation & Environmental Engr
Phone: 620-277-4522
Email: preynolds@sunflower.net

Tampa Electric Company
702 N. Franklin St., P.O. Box 111, Plaza 5
Tampa, FL  33601-0111

Victoria Jones
Manager, Combustion Byproducts
Phone: 813-228-1006
Fax: 813-228-1033
Email: vmjones@tecoenergy.com
---

**Tennessee Valley Authority**  
1101 Market St., LP 5G  
Chattanooga, TN 37377  

**Michael Sutton**  
Manager, CCP Marketing & Utilization  
Phone: 423-751-3539  
Fax: 423-751-9523  
Email: mesutton@tva.gov

**Tri-State Generation & Transmission Association, Inc.**  
P.O. Box 33695  
Denver, CO 80233  

**Stephen Powell**  
Senior Fuels Engineer  
Phone: 303-254-3485  
Fax: 303-921-8243  
Email: stepow@tristategt.org

**We Energies**  
231 W. Michigan St.  
Milwaukee, WI 53201  

**Art Cové PE**  
CCP Management, Principal Engineer  
Phone: 414-221-4618  
Fax: 414-221-2022  
Email: art.covi@we-energies.com

**Wisconsin Public Service**  
700 N. Adams St.  
Green Bay, WI 54307  

**Dawn DeJardin**  
Fuel and Byproduct Analyst  
Phone: 920-433-5787  
Email: dmdejardin@wisconsinpublicservice.com

**Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.**  
P.O. Box 229, 101 W. Watergate Rd.  
Cadillac, MI 49601  

**Daniel DeCoeur**  
Engineering Manager  
Phone: 231-775-5700  
Fax: 231-775-2077  
Email: ddecoeur@wpsci.com

**Xcel Energy**  
1800 Larimer St., Ste 1300  
Denver, CO 80202-1414  

**Jennifer McCarter REM**  
Environmental Analyst  
Phone: 303-294-2228  
Fax: 303-294-2328  
Email: jennifer.mccarter@xcelenergy.com

---

**Marketer**

**Ash Grove Resources, LLC**  
5375 SW 7th St., Ste 400  
Topeka, KS 66606-2552  

**Brady Pryor**  
President  
Phone: 785-267-1996  
Fax: 785-267-4360  
Email: brady.pryor@ashgroveresources.com

**Boral Material Technologies Inc.**  
200 Mansell Cc East, Ste 305  
Roswell, GA 30076  

**John Scoggan**  
Vice President, Utility Relations  
Phone: 678-639-7016  
Fax: 770-552-3372  
Email: john.scoggan@boral.com

---

**Carmeuse Lime & Stone, Inc.**  
3600 Neville Rd.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15225  

**Tiffany Duffy**  
Technical Marketing Manager – FDT  
Phone: 412-777-0738  
Email: tiffany.duffy@carmeusena.com

---

**Charah, Inc.**  
12601 Plantside Dr.  
Louisville, KY 40299  

**Charles Price**  
President & CEO  
Phone: 502-245-1353  
Fax: 502-245-7398  
Email: cprice@charah.com

**Essroc – Italcementi Group**  
3251 Bath Pike  
Nazareth, PA 18064  

**Gary Molchan**  
VP Environmental Affairs  
Phone: 610-837-6725  
Fax: 610-837-9614  
Email: gary.molchan@essroc.com

**FlyAshDirect**  
4228 Airport Rd.  
Cincinnati, OH 45226  

**Jim Irvine**  
President  
Phone: 513-871-9733  
Fax: 513-871-1974  
Email: jim@flyashdirect.com

---

**Headwaters Resources**  
10653 S. Riverfront Parkway  
South Jordan, UT 84095  

**Gary England**  
Vice President, Western Region  
Phone: 801-984-9491  
Fax: 801-984-9499  
Email: gengland@headwaters.com

---
Our Industry is Changing. Is Your CCP Management Program Ready for the Challenge?

Trans-Ash is prepared to provide state-of-the-art, creative, cost-effective, and environmentally acceptable CCP management alternatives:

- Landfill Design
- Landfill Construction
- Landfill Management
- Ash Pond Management
- Ash Pond Closure and Remediation
- Dredging Services
- Environmental Remediation

To learn more, call Trans-Ash at 513-733-4770 or visit us online at www.transash.com

Trans-Ash, Inc.
617 Shepherd Dr., P.O. Box 15396
Cincinnati, OH 45215

Bruce Kazich
National Sales Manager
Phone: 513-733-4770
Fax: 513-554-6147
Email: bkazich@transash.com

VHSC Cement, LLC
2204 Timberloch Place, Ste 248
The Woodlands, TX 77380

Clinton Pike
President
Phone: 281-419-2422
Fax: 281-419-2446
Email: bpike@pozzoslag.com

Harsco Minerals
5000 Ritter Rd., Ste 205
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Pat Kelley
Technical Development Manager
Phone: 717-506-2067
Fax: 717-506-1754
Email: pkelley@harsco.com

Lehigh Hanson, Inc.
7660 Imperial Way
Allentown, PA 18195-1040

Mark Stillwagon
Senior Regional Purchasing Manager
Phone: 610-366-4761
Fax: 610-366-4616
Email: mstillwagon@lehighcement.com

Salt River Materials Group
8800 E. Chaparral Rd., Ste 155
Scottsdale, AZ 85250-2606

Dale Diulus P.E.
Vice President, Pozzolans & Logistics
Phone: 480-850-5757
Fax: 480-850-5758
Email: ddiulus@srmaterials.com

Waste Management
583 Driftwood Dr.
Lake Milton, OH 44429

Jerry Brumert
Strategic Business Director, Electric Utility
Phone: 330-519-7877
Email: jbrumert@wm.com

Eagle Environmental Services, LLC
P.O. Box 368
Harleyville, SC 29448

Marvin Brown
President
Phone: 843-462-7620
Fax: 843-462-7624
Email: mbrown@eesllc.biz

Full Circle Solutions, Inc.
35 North Main St., Ste A
Jasper, GA 30143

Bob Waldrop P.E.
President
Phone: 706-253-1051
Fax: 706-253-1054
Email: bwaldrop@fcsi.biz

Harsco Minerals
5000 Ritter Rd., Ste 205
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Pat Kelley
Technical Development Manager
Phone: 717-506-2067
Fax: 717-506-1754
Email: pkelley@harsco.com

Lehigh Hanson, Inc.
7660 Imperial Way
Allentown, PA 18195-1040

Mark Stillwagon
Senior Regional Purchasing Manager
Phone: 610-366-4761
Fax: 610-366-4616
Email: mstillwagon@lehighcement.com

Mineral Resource Technologies, Inc. – A CEMEX Company
920 Memorial City Way, Ste 100
Houston, TX 77024

Gilberto Gonzalez
Business Development
Phone: 713-973-5062
Fax: 832-213-4232
Email: gilberto.gonzalezg@cemex.com

Nebraska Ash Company
1815 Y St., P.O. Box 80268
Lincoln, NE 68501

Dale Kisling
President
Phone: 402-434-1777
Fax: 402-434-1799
Email: dalek@nebraskaash.com

Salt River Materials Group
8800 E. Chaparral Rd., Ste 155
Scottsdale, AZ 85250-2606

Dale Diulus P.E.
Vice President, Pozzolans & Logistics
Phone: 480-850-5757
Fax: 480-850-5758
Email: ddiulus@srmaterials.com

Waste Management
583 Driftwood Dr.
Lake Milton, OH 44429

Jerry Brumert
Strategic Business Director, Electric Utility
Phone: 330-519-7877
Email: jbrumert@wm.com

Eagle Environmental Services, LLC
P.O. Box 368
Harleyville, SC 29448

Marvin Brown
President
Phone: 843-462-7620
Fax: 843-462-7624
Email: mbrown@eesllc.biz

Full Circle Solutions, Inc.
35 North Main St., Ste A
Jasper, GA 30143

Bob Waldrop P.E.
President
Phone: 706-253-1051
Fax: 706-253-1054
Email: bwaldrop@fcsi.biz

Harsco Minerals
5000 Ritter Rd., Ste 205
Mechanicsburg, PA 17055

Pat Kelley
Technical Development Manager
Phone: 717-506-2067
Fax: 717-506-1754
Email: pkelley@harsco.com

Lehigh Hanson, Inc.
7660 Imperial Way
Allentown, PA 18195-1040

Mark Stillwagon
Senior Regional Purchasing Manager
Phone: 610-366-4761
Fax: 610-366-4616
Email: mstillwagon@lehighcement.com
Build your gypsum market with GYPSOIL™

Agriculture represents a large and growing market opportunity for your byproduct gypsum. The GYPSOIL™ Division of Beneficial Reuse Management is the market leader in promoting and expanding this use. We understand grower decision-making, agronomy and soil science, the agricultural distribution system and the regulatory environment.

Partner with GYPSOIL/Beneficial Reuse Management to put your byproduct gypsum to productive reuse in agriculture instead of in the landfill. That's good for your bottom line and good for the environment.

GYPSOIL provides:
- Comprehensive agricultural dealer network
- Brand recognized by growers
- Extensive advertising and promotion
- Dedicated local sales teams
- Leadership in research
- Technical support for growers and dealers
- Permitting and regulatory assistance

GYPSOIL/Beneficial Reuse Management
Call us today to learn more. (800) 686-6610
BeneficialReuse.com

GYPSONIL™ BRAND GYPSUM

GYPSONIL™ is a division and trademark of Beneficial Reuse Management LLC.
McDonald Farms Enterprises, Inc.
7247 East County Line Rd.
Longmont, CO  80504

Randall McDonald
General Manager
Phone: 303-772-4577
Fax: 303-442-5706
Email: r.l.mcdonald@mcdonaldfarmsinc.com

Mobile Abrasives, Inc.
P.O. Box 1156
Mobile, AL  36633

Matt Serda
CFO
Phone: 251-694-0024 x 4
Fax: 251-694-7993
Email: mattserda@mobileabrasives.com

Pozzi-Tech, Inc.
4700 Vestal Pkwy E., Ste 257
Vestal, NY  13850

Terry Watson
President
Phone: 607-798-0655
Fax: 607-770-7956
Email: tewatson@pozzitech.com

Romano Associates
130 Woodbridge Ave.
Buffalo, NY  14214-6424

Peter Romano
President
Phone: 716-837-5595
Fax: 716-837-5594
Email: pjr@pjromano.com

Sphere One, Inc.
601 Cumberland, Building 32
Chattanooga, TN  37404

Kip Clayton
Materials Manager
Phone: 865-253-5870
Fax: 423-678-0614
Email: kclayton@sphereone.net

Synthetic Materials, LLC
6009 Brownsboro Park Blvd.
Louisville, KY  40207

John Glasscock
President
Phone: 502-895-2810
Email: jrg@synmat.com

U.S. Minerals
2105 North Winds Dr.
Dyer, IN  46311

Jason Vukas
Vice President
Phone: 219-864-0909
Fax: 219-864-4675
Email: jvukas@us-minerals.com

USC Technologies, LLC
1300 NW Briarcliff Pkwy., Ste 250
Kansas City, MO  64150

Richie Benninghoven
President and Manager
Phone: 816-595-3013
Fax: 816-595-3015
Email: rcb@usckc.com

USNR Energy Services
212 State St., P.O. Box 256
Belle Vernon, PA  15012

Bob Carter
Vice President
Phone: 724-929-8405
Fax: 724-934-5543
Email: b_carter@usnr-energy.com

ADA Carbon Solutions
8100 Southpark Way, Unit A-2
Littleton, CO  80120

Robert Huston
Western Regional Sales Manager
Phone: 720-480-5819
Fax: 303-962-1970
Email: rhuston@ada-CS.com

ADA Environmental Solutions, Inc.
8100 Southpark Way, Unit B
Littleton, CO  80120-4527

James Mitchell
Director of Sales and Marketing
Phone: 303-962-1972
Fax: 303-734-0330
Email: jamesm@adaes.com

Advanced Wall Technologies, LLC
4870 Sadler Rd., Ste 300
Glen Allen, VA  23060

Carlton Dudding
Managing Partner
Phone: 804-205-5153
Fax: 804-205-5151
Email: carlton@awtresources.com

AECOM
250 Apollo Dr.
Chelmsford, MA  01824

Lisa Bradley PhD, DABT
VP & Sr Toxicologist, PhD & DABT
Phone: 978-905-2131
Fax: 978-905-2101
Email: lisa.brady@aecom.com

Agru America, Inc.
500 Garrison Rd.
Georgetown, SC  29440

Don DiGuilio
Northeast Marketing Manager
Phone: 724-503-5998
Email: ddmiglio@agruamerica.com

American Gypsum
3811 Turtle Creek Blvd., Ste 1200
Dallas, TX  75219

Dave Powers
President
Phone: 214-530-5555
Fax: 214-530-5636
Email: dave.powers@americangypsum.com

CalStar Products
6851 Mowry Ave.
Newark, CA  94560

Julie Rapoport PhD; PE; LEED AP
VP Product Management
Phone: 510-793-9500
Fax: 510-793-9501
Email: jrapoport@calstarproducts.com

Associate
EnergySolutions
423 West 300 South, Ste 200
Salt Lake City, UT  84101

Peter Fote
Director
Phone: 801-649-2000
Email: ppfote@energysolutions.com

Environmental Standards, Inc.
1140 Valley Forge Rd., P.O. Box 810
Valley Forge, PA  19482

Rock Vitale
CEO and Principal Chemist
Phone: 610-935-5577
Fax: 610-935-5583
Email: rvitale@envstd.com

Fiore and Sons, Inc.
730 West 62nd Ave.
Denver, CO  80216

Mike Fiore
President
Phone: 303-429-8893
Fax: 303-429-3035
Email: mike@fioreandsons.com

First Union Rail
6250 River Rd., Ste 5000, MAC N2806-050
Rosemont, IL  60018

Michael Rulis
Regional Vice President, Sales
Phone: 847-384-5334
Fax: 847-318-7588
Email: michael.rulis@firstunionrail.com

Flash Fill Services, LLC
P.O. Box 16091
Denver, CO  80216

Doug Hernandez
President
Phone: 303-292-7343
Fax: 303-292-1176
Email: flashfill@qwestoffice.net

GSE Lining Technology, LLC
19103 Gundie Rd.
Houston, TX  77073

Mark Arnold
President and CEO
Phone: 281-230-6710
Fax: 281-230-2504
Email: marnold@gseworld.com

GSE Consultants, Inc.
4101 Triangle Lane
Export, PA  15632-1358

Gary Brendel
Senior Director, Power Facilities Engineering
Phone: 724-387-2170
Fax: 412-476-2020
Email: g.brendel@gseconsultants.com

Georgi-Pacific Gypsum LLC
2861 Miller Rd.
Decatur, GA  30035

Fabio Esguerra
Technical Center Manager
Phone: 770-987-5190 x 110104
Fax: 770-981-6356
Email: feesguer@gapac.com

Haver Filling Systems, Inc.
460 Gees Mill Business Court
Conyers, GA  30013

Bill Christ
Business Development Manager – US
Phone: 770-760-1130
Fax: 770-760-1181
Email: bill.christ@haverusa.com

HDR Engineering
5426 Bay Center Dr., Ste 400
Tampa, FL  33609-3444

Subrata Bandyopadhyay PE; ScD; MBA
Vice President
Phone: 813-262-2784
Fax: 813-282-2430
Email: subrata.bandy@hdrinc.com

Hilltop Enterprises, Inc.
1157 Phoenixville Pike, Ste 102
West Chester, PA  19380

Albert Silkoski
President
Phone: 610-430-6920
Fax: 610-430-6921
Email: asilkoski@hilltopenterprises.com

Hull & Associates, Inc.
3401 Glendale Ave., Ste 300
Toledo, OH  43614

William Petruzz PG
Waste Management Division Leader
Phone: 419-385-2018
Fax: 419-385-5487
Email: bpetruzzi@hullinc.com

Hilltop Enterprises, Inc.
1157 Phoenixville Pike, Ste 102
West Chester, PA  19380

Albert Silkoski
President
Phone: 610-430-6920
Fax: 610-430-6921
Email: asilkoski@hilltopenterprises.com

Hull & Associates, Inc.
3401 Glendale Ave., Ste 300
Toledo, OH  43614

William Petruzz PG
Waste Management Division Leader
Phone: 419-385-2018
Fax: 419-385-5487
Email: bpetruzzi@hullinc.com
Specialized Utility Plant Services

• Coal & Ash Handling Solutions
• Coal & Ash Transportation
• Water Filtration & Processing
• Bulk Transportation of All Materials
• Ash & Waste Management
• Resource Recovery & Marketing
• High Powered Wet & Dry Vacuuming
• Excavation for Ponds & Landfills

7440 I-25 Frontage Rd (East Side), Frederick, CO 80530
(303) 772-4577 • Metro (303) 442-6829 • Fax (303) 442-5706

ARE YOU BEING ASKED TO provide information on how concrete provides real value for sustainability, durability, and resilience? The Concrete Joint Sustainability Initiative has created an online resource center and toolkit to help.

Go online to access these free materials and to sign up for the SUSTA/N e-newsletter.

CONNECT ON:
www.sustainableconcrete.org

Recycled Materials
Energy-Efficient Homes
Green Schools
Disaster-Resistant Buildings
Long-Lasting Roads
Resilient Infrastructure
Stormwater Management Solutions

Concrete Joint Sustainability Initiative
(think harder, concrete.)
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Please contact the American Coal Ash Association if any of your membership information needs to be updated.

www.acaa-usa.org
Raise the handling of your coal combustion products to a new level with FLSmidth’s superior dry process. It completely eliminates fly ash ponds, preventing potential hazards to the environment.

Since your needs are unique, we offer a wide range of solutions that match your exact handling requirements. You’ll find tailor-made systems for ashes and scrubber solids – dry or dewatered – and extensive pneumatic, slurry, paste and mechanical capabilities. It’s just another integrated part of the total solutions we’ve been offering the minerals and cement industries since 1882.

Want more dry (but interesting) facts?
See www.flsmidth.com
The Proven Leader in
Synthetic Gypsum Processing
and Management

Specializing in ...

- Design and Build Services for Gypsum Dewatering Systems
- Management of Gypsum Slurry to Eliminate Production Risks to Utilities
- Production of Quality Gypsum Cake for Commercial and Agriculture Applications
- Operation and Maintenance Services for all FGD Systems
- Comprehensive FGD Laboratory Services
- Market Development and Transportation of Synthetic Gypsum

Contact SYNMAT at: info@synmatusa.com
6009 Brownsboro Park Blvd., Louisville, KY 40207

Phone: 502-895-2810 Fax: 502-895-2812 Website: SYNMAT.com
DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGIES
for Fly Ash Quality

– Ammonia Removal
– Blended fly ash
– Solutions for FGD material and off-spec ash

INTRODUCING PRODUCTS
for Increasing Ash Utilization

– FlexCrete™ Aerated Concrete
– Concrete Block and brick
– Road bases and fills

EXPANDING SYSTEMS
for Coast to Coast Marketing

– Nationwide network of source locations and terminals marketing millions of tons annually for traditional concrete production

PROVIDING SERVICES
for Coal Ash Generation

– Landfill design, construction, operation and closure
– Environmental site assessment and permitting
– Utility and industrial equipment and site maintenance

HEADWATERS RESOURCES
1-888-236-6236  -  www.flyash.com