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In accordance with our proposal 01.P000177.11, dated March 28, 2011, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Contract No. EP10W001313, Order No. EP-B11S-00049, GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. (GZA) has completed our inspection of the Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L) Killen Electric Generating Station (KEGS, Site) Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond located in Manchester, Ohio. The Site visit was conducted on June 7, 2011. The purpose of our efforts was to provide the EPA with a Site-specific evaluation of the impoundments to assist EPA in visually assessing the structural stability of the impoundments under the authority of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Section 104(e). We are submitting one hard copy and one CD-ROM copy of this Draft Report directly to the EPA.

In GZA’s professional opinion, the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond embankments appear to be sound and no immediate remedial action appears to be necessary, based upon the information provided and our observations. However, based on EPA’s inspection criteria, the overall condition of both the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond is judged to be POOR because no geotechnical computations were made available to GZA for review. Thus, the stability of the embankments could not be independently verified. Further discussion of our evaluation and recommended actions are presented in the Round 10 Dam Assessment Report. The report includes: (a) completed Field Assessment Checklists; (b) figures of the impoundments; and (c) selected photographs with captions. Our services and report are subject to the Limitations found in Appendix A and the Terms and Conditions of our contract agreement.
We are happy to have been able to assist you with this inspection and appreciate the opportunity to continue to provide you with dam engineering consulting services. Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions or comments regarding the content of this Round 10 Dam Assessment Report.

Sincerely,

GZA GEOENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Frank Vetere, P.E. (OH)  Chad W. Cox, P.E. (MA)
Senior Project Manager  Consultant/Reviewer
frank.vetere@gza.com  chad.cox@gza.com

Peter Baril, P.E. (MA)
Principal
peter.baril@gza.com
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Inspection Report presents the results of a visual inspection of the Dayton Power and Light (DP&L, Owner) Killen Electric Generating Station (KEGS, Site) Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond located in Manchester, Ohio. The visual inspection was performed on June 7, 2011 by representatives of GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc (GZA), accompanied by representatives of DP&L and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR).

Based on the maximum height of 58 feet and a storage volume of approximately 2,090 acre-feet (at the maximum elevation of approximately 573 feet NGVD 29), the Bottom Ash Pond is classified as an Intermediate sized structure. Based on the maximum height of 77 feet and a storage volume of approximately 11,350 acre-feet (at the maximum elevation of approximately 573 feet), the Fly Ash Pond is classified as an Intermediate sized structure. Size classifications are based on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) guidelines. The ODNR considers the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond to be one unit, and has assigned a classification of “Class I” based on height (greater than 60 feet) and storage capacity (greater than 5,000 acre-feet).

Under the EPA classification system, as presented on page 2 of the EPA checklist (Appendix C) and Definitions section (Appendix B), it is GZA’s opinion that both the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond would be considered as having a High hazard potential. In addition to the potential for economic loss, environmental damage, damage of lifeline facilities (power plant, US 52 etc.) and impact to other concerns including the Ohio River, GZA’s opinion as to the hazard potential rating is based on the possibility that loss of human life would occur as a result of failure or misoperation of the ponds, particularly given the proximity of the ponds to the power plant. The ODNR considers the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond to be one unit and has assigned a hazard classification of “Class II”, but has assigned an overall (combined size, storage and hazard) “Class I” designation to the ponds.

In GZA’s professional opinion, the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond embankments appear to be sound and no immediate remedial action appears to be necessary, based upon the information provided and our observations. However, based on EPA’s inspection criteria, the overall condition of both the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond is judged to be POOR because no geotechnical computations were made available to GZA for review. Thus, the stability of the embankments could not be independently verified. Based on the results of the visual inspection, discussions with DP&L personnel, and a review of available design documentation, the following deficiencies were noted:

The Bottom Ash Pond was found to have the following deficiencies:

1. Portions of the outer embankment slopes had not been mowed recently;
2. No instrumentation (i.e., staff gauge) to observe the elevation of the water within the pond/impoundment;
3. Presence of undersized rip rap on portions of the interior embankment;
4. Presence of vegetation on the interior slope of the embankment;
5. Timber from recent vegetation clearing near Station 3+00 remains on the outer embankments slope;
6. DP&L personnel were unsure if the discharge pipes from the pump station inlet structure to the ash water pumps have been inspected internally since they were installed;
7. Limited freeboard in the vicinity of Station 3+00 to 5+00; and,
8. Reported crest and normal pool elevations indicate potential for non-compliance with state freeboard requirement of five feet for Class I dams.

The Fly Ash Pond was found to have the following deficiencies:

1. With the exception of the upper 20 to 30 feet, a majority of the outer embankment slopes had not been mowed recently;
2. Presence of undersized rip rap on portions of the interior embankment;
3. Apparent benching of the interior embankments slopes in the vicinity of Station 60+00;
4. Presence of vegetation on the interior slope of the embankment;
5. Presence of wet areas at or near the toe of the outer embankment slopes between Stations 36+00 to 39+00 and in the vicinity of Stations 80+00 and 88+00;
6. DP&L personnel were unsure if the discharge pipes from the decant structure to the outfall have been inspected internally since they were installed;
7. Reported crest and normal pool elevations indicate potential for non-compliance with state freeboard requirement of five feet for Class I dams; and,
9. Presence of established vegetation near the lower portion and toe of the outer embankment slopes near the outfall structure.

GZA recommends that the Owner arrange for the following to be performed:

**Studies and Analyses:**

1. Survey of the crest of both ponds by a licensed Professional Surveyor to evaluate the current elevation profile of the crest and confirm that survey monuments are not moving horizontally;
2. Install piezometers/observation wells in the noted wet areas (between Stations 36+00 to 39+00 and in the vicinity of Stations 80+00 and 88+00) to evaluate water levels, and possibly water chemistry, in these areas. This activity may require consultation and/or design by a licensed Professional Engineer;
3. Based on data from piezometers/observation wells, perform a seepage analysis and assess need for subsurface toe drainage in wet locations and make improvements as needed;
4. Resolve pending variance with ODNR regarding reducing the minimum freeboard requirement from five feet to three feet;
5. Provide or perform spillway analysis to demonstrate capacity of discharge structures to accommodate the regulatory Spillway Design Flood with the proposed normal pool freeboard; and,
6. Provide or perform a slope stability analysis for the embankments. Analysis should include assessment of upstream slope stability in light of observed movement of riprap. Analysis may require a subsurface exploration program to develop appropriate input data. Most recent inspection should be provided to the EPA for review.

**Operation & Maintenance Activities:**

1. Clear vegetation from the interior embankment slopes of both ponds;
2. Remove stumps that are 4-inches or more in diameter resulting from the removal of trees and brush on the outer embankment near Station 3+00;
3. Install a staff gauge on or near the pump station inlet structure in order to take periodic measurements of the Bottom Ash Pond water surface elevation;
4. Inspect each of the piezometers around the toe of the pond embankments and ensure each piezometers has a cap, lockable protective cover/casing and is visible during mowing operations;
5. Ensure each survey monument is protected and is visible during mowing operations;
6. If DP&L has the opportunity to stop discharging from the Bottom Ash Pond for a limited time period, inspect the discharge pipes from the pump station inlet structure to the ash water pumps to verify that they are operating correctly and are in good condition. This may be performed by video photography; and,
7. If DP&L has the opportunity to stop discharging from the Fly Ash Pond for a limited time period, inspect the discharge pipes from the decant structure to the outfall structure to verify that they are operating correctly and are in good condition. This may be performed by video photography.

Repair Recommendations:

1. Clear the area of established vegetation near the lower portion and toe of the outer embankment slopes near the outfall structure; and,
2. Restore riprap in sections where displacement has occurred.
PREFACE

The assessment of the general condition of the embankments at the Dayton Power and Light Company’s Killen Electric Generating Station is based upon available data and visual inspections. Detailed investigations and analyses involving topographic mapping, subsurface investigations, testing, and detailed computational evaluations are beyond the scope of this report.

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the embankment is based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection, along with data available to the inspection team. In cases where an impoundment is lowered or drained prior to inspection, such action, while improving the stability and safety of the embankment, removes the normal load on the structure and may obscure certain conditions, which might otherwise be detectable if inspected under the normal operating environment of the structure.

It is critical to note that the condition of the embankment depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the embankment will continue to represent the condition of the embankment at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that unsafe conditions be detected.

Prepared by:

GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc.

Frank Vetere, P.E.
Senior Project Manager
Ohio License No.: 62568
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1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

1.1 General

1.1.1 Authority

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has retained GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. (GZA) to perform a visual inspection and develop a report of conditions for The Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L, Owner) Killen Electric Generating Station (KEGS, Site) Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond in Manchester, Ohio. This assessment was authorized by the EPA under the authority of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Section 104(e). This assessment and draft report were performed in accordance with Round 10 of the Assessment of Dam Safety of Coal Combustion Surface Impoundments, RFQ-DC-16, dated March 16, 2011, and EPA Contract No. EP10W001313, Order No. EP-B11S-00049. The assessment generally conformed to the requirements of the Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety¹. This report is subject to the limitations contained in Appendix A and the Terms and Conditions of our Contract Agreement.

1.1.2 Purpose of Work

The purpose of this assessment was to visually assess and evaluate the present condition of the Impoundments and appurtenant structures to attempt to identify observable conditions that may adversely affect their structural stability and functionality, to note the extent of any deterioration that may be observed, review the status of maintenance and needed repairs, and to evaluate the conformity with current design and construction standards of care.

The assessment was divided into five parts: 1) obtain and review available reports, investigations, and data from the Owner pertaining to the impoundments and appurtenant structures; 2) perform an on-Site review with the Owner of available design, inspection, and maintenance data and procedures for the Impoundments; 3) perform a visual assessment of the Site; 4) prepare and submit a field assessment checklist; and, 5) prepare and submit a draft and a final report presenting the evaluation of the Impoundments, including recommendations and proposed remedial actions.

1.1.3 Definitions

To provide the reader with a better understanding of the report, definitions of commonly used terms associated with dams are provided in Appendix B. Many of these terms may be included within this report. The terms are presented under common categories associated with dams which include: 1) orientation; 2) dam components; 3) size classification; 4) hazard classification; 5) general; and, 6) condition rating.

1.2 Description of Project

1.2.1 Location

The Killen Electric Generating Station (KEGS) is located approximately 7 miles east of the city of Manchester, Ohio, along the shore of the Ohio River, at the address 14869 US 52, Manchester, Ohio 45144. The KEGS Bottom Ash Pond is located approximately 1,650 feet southeast of the KEGS at latitude 38° 41' 22" North and longitude 83° 28' 14" West. The KEGS Fly Ash Pond is located approximately 3,100 feet southeast of the KEGS at latitude 38° 41' 01" North and longitude 83° 28' 14" West. A site loci of the Bottom Ash Pond, the Fly Ash Pond and surrounding area is shown on Figure 1. An aerial photograph of the Bottom Ash Pond, Fly Ash Pond and surrounding area is provided as Figure 2. The Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond can be accessed by vehicles from a service road leading from the KEGS that leads to an access road on the crest of each embankment.

1.2.2 Owner/Caretaker

The KEGS is owned (67%) and operated by DP&L of Dayton, Ohio. The KEGS is also owned (33%) by Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, a subsidiary of Duke Energy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dam Owner/Caretaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City, State, Zip</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3 Purpose of the Ponds

The KEGS is a one unit coal-fired power plant with a maximum generating capacity of approximately 600 megawatts. Commercial operation of the KEGS facility began in June 30, 1982. The Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond were constructed in conjunction with the KEGS facility for the purpose of storing and disposing coal combustion byproducts. Wastewater discharged from the Bottom Ash Pond and the Fly Ash Pond is regulated under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA).

The Bottom Ash Pond was constructed for the purpose of storing and disposing plant wastewater, cooling tower blow-down, bottom ash sluice water, and excess stormwater. Coal pile runoff and water from the plant drains was historically directed to the Bottom Ash Pond, but

---

2 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. OIB00022, Killen Electric Generating Station, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, August 1, 2009.
was reportedly re-directed to the Fly Ash Pond in 2010. Pond stormwater (direct precipitation) and bottom ash wastewater pumped from the KEGS bottom ash system and cooling tower basin is directed to the Bottom Ash Pond at an estimated combined maximum rate of 30.7 million gallons per day (MGD). Wastewater is discharged from the Bottom Ash Pond to the Fly Ash Pond via an overflow structure at an estimated maximum rate of 30.5 MGD and also recycled to the bottom ash system, fly ash system and the oil and grease separator at a combined maximum rate of 12.7 MGD. The overall Fly Ash Pond plan is shown on Figure 3.

The Fly Ash Pond was constructed for the purpose of storing and disposing plant wastewater and fly ash from the KEGS facility. Beginning in 2010, the Fly Ash Pond also receives coal pile runoff and water from the plant drains. Pond stormwater (direct precipitation) and bottom ash wastewater pumped from the KEGS bottom ash system and cooling tower basin is directed to the Bottom Ash Pond at an estimated combined maximum rate of 27.3 MGD and from the Bottom Ash Pond at an estimated maximum rate of 30.5 MGD. Wastewater from the Fly Ash Pond is discharged to the Ohio River at an estimated maximum rate of 57.7 MGD.

The overall Fly Ash Pond plan is shown on Figure 3.

1.2.4 Description of the Bottom Ash Pond and Appurtenances

The following description of the Bottom Ash Pond is based on the Owner interviews, design reports provided by the Owner, as-built drawings, and field observations by GZA.

The Bottom Ash Pond consists of an earthfill embankment with an impervious fill core and a crest length of approximately 5,075 feet. The maximum crest height (from the lowest toe elevation to the top of embankment) is approximately 58 feet. A road along the top of the crest has a width of approximately 10 feet and a design elevation of approximately 573 feet, National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD 29). Actual crest elevations reportedly range from 572.1 to 573 feet. The Bottom Ash Pond base was reportedly keyed into the existing natural grade (bottom of excavation elevation of 492 feet) and supplemented with a 6 foot thick impervious fill layer to form the pond liner with a top of liner elevation of 498 feet. A 6-foot thick layer of impervious fill was also placed on a portion of the interior slope to tie into the existing natural clay materials. Both the inner and outer slopes of the embankment have a slope of approximately 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical (2.5H:1V). The Bottom Ash Pond has not been expanded or raised since its original construction.

The Bottom Ash Pond has two discharge points. Outfall No. 1 is located near the southeast corner of the Bottom Ash Pond and provides recycled make-up water to the power plant. Outfall No. 1 is comprised of an 8-foot diameter, 58-foot high reinforced concrete pump station intake tower with a 36-inch sluice gate. Water flow is conveyed by gravity from the

---

3 Based on estimated maximum flows from a Water Balance Diagram (Figure 2 of NPDES Permit) provided by Mr. Scott Arentsen of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
4 Based on estimated maximum flows from a Water Balance Diagram (Figure 2 of NPDES Permit) provided by Mr. Scott Arentsen of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
5 Based on estimated maximum flows from a Water Balance Diagram (Figure 2 of NPDES Permit) provided by Mr. Scott Arentsen of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
6 Based on estimated maximum flows from a Water Balance Diagram (Figure 2 of NPDES Permit) provided by Mr. Scott Arentsen of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
7 Based on review of DP&L Drawing 400-12-1092 provided by Mr. John Hendrix of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
Bottom Ash Pond to the plant by one 36-inch diameter ductile iron pipe which rests on a 9-inch thick sand bedding within a 72-inch diameter corrugated metal pipe with an open annulus.

According to DP&L Drawing 400-12-1092 provided by the Owner, the 72-inch diameter pipe exits the intake tower at an invert elevation of 511 feet, extends through the embankment and joins other plant related equipment at an invert elevation of 509.75 feet. Six seepage collars are shown along the pipeline at even spacing.

Outfall No. 2 is located near the northeast corner of the Bottom Ash Pond on the intermediate berm that divides the Bottom Ash Pond from the Fly Ash Pond. Outfall No. 2 is a 10-foot wide reinforced concrete channel with stop logs to control water level starting at an invert elevation of 565 feet and with a maximum elevation of approximately 572.75 feet, which is the bottom of the 15-inch thick concrete slab comprising the bridge over the discharge structure (top of concrete elevation shown as 574 feet).

Two drainage ditches, Ditch A and Ditch B, were constructed around the perimeter of the Bottom Ash Pond and the Fly Ash Pond, beyond the toe of the embankments. The purpose of the ditches is to divert runoff from the exterior slopes and several T-drains located on the embankments and direct it away from the embankments and ultimately to the Ohio River. Refer to Figures 3 and 4 for the approximate locations of Ditch A and Ditch B.

Instrumentation at the Bottom Ash Pond includes two survey monuments (SM2 and SM3) installed on the top of the embankment (at the edge of the exterior slope) and two piezometers (W-1 and W-2) installed at the toe of the exterior slope. Refer to Figures 3 and 4 for the locations of the survey monuments and piezometers. Additional information on the construction and performance history of the Bottom Ash Pond is provided in Sections 1.3.6 and 1.3.8 of this report.

1.2.5 Description of the Fly Ash Pond and Appurtenances

The following description of the Fly Ash Pond is based on the Owner interviews, design reports provided by the Owner, as-built drawings, and field observations by GZA.

The Fly Ash Pond consists of an earthfill embankment with an impervious fill core and a crest length of approximately 11,200 feet. The maximum crest height (from the lowest toe elevation to the top of embankment) is approximately 77 feet, according to DP&L’s draft Operation, Maintenance and Inspection (OMI) Manual dated May 5, 2010. However, conflicting information is presented in the April 7, 2008 Dam Safety Inspection Report prepared by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), which indicates a dam height of 84 feet. A road along the top of the crest has a width of approximately 10 feet and a design elevation of approximately 573 feet. Actual crest elevations reportedly range from 572 to 573 feet. The Fly Ash Pond base was reportedly keyed into the existing natural grade (bottom of excavation elevation of 498 feet) and supplemented with a layer of impervious fill to form a pond liner with a thickness ranging from 2 feet near the center of the pond to 6 feet at the toe of the interior slope. The Fly Ash Pond liner was designed with a top of liner elevation ranging from 500 feet to 504 feet at the toe of the interior slope. A 6-foot thick layer of impervious fill was also placed on a portion of the interior slope to tie into the existing natural clay materials. Both the inner and outer slopes of the embankment have a slope of...
approximately 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical (2.5H:1V). The Fly Ash Pond has not been expanded or raised since its original construction.

The Fly Ash Pond has one discharge point. The decant structure is located near the southwest corner of the Fly Ash Pond and conveys water to the final outfall point identified as “Outfall 001” in the 2009 NDPES permit (refer to Figure 3 for locations). The decant structure is comprised of a 17-foot by 18-foot rectangular reinforced concrete overflow structure where water from the Fly Ash Pond enters through a 26-inch sluice gate. Once inside the overflow structure, water is conveyed through a 42-inch sluice gate and a 10-foot long, 42-inch diameter reinforced concrete pipe to a 4-foot by 4-foot square reinforced concrete standpipe with a height of 61 feet. From the base of the standpipe, water flow is conveyed from the Fly Ash Pond to the outfall (“Outfall 001”) by one 36-inch diameter ductile iron pipe which is encased in a 72-inch diameter corrugated metal pipe with an open annulus.

According to DP&L Drawing 400-12-1082 provided by the Owner, the 72-inch diameter pipe exits the standpipe at an invert elevation of 513.5 feet, extends through the embankment and discharges to an energy dissipater where the water then flows through a Parshall Flume into Ditch B and ultimately into the Ohio River. Four seepage collars are shown along the pipeline at even spacing.

As discussed in Section 1.2.4, two drainage ditches, Ditch A and Ditch B, were constructed around the perimeter of the Bottom Ash Pond and the Fly Ash Pond, beyond the toe of the embankments. The purpose of the ditches is to divert runoff from the exterior slopes and several T-drains located on the embankments and direct it away from the embankments and ultimately to the Ohio River. Refer to Figure 3 and 4 for the approximate locations of Ditch A and Ditch B.

Instrumentation at the Fly Ash Pond includes eight survey monuments (SM1 and SM4 through SM-10) installed on the top of the embankment (at the edge of the exterior slope) and six piezometers (W-3 through W-8) installed at the toe of the exterior slope. Refer to Figures 3 and 4 for the locations of the survey monuments and piezometers. Additional information on the construction and performance history of the Fly Ash Pond is provided in Sections 1.3.7 and 1.3.8 of this report. Additional information on the construction and performance history of the Fly Ash Pond is provided in Section 1.3.7 of this report.

1.2.6 Operations and Maintenance of the Bottom Ash Pond

The Bottom Ash Pond operates under Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) Permit No. 76-092. In accordance with Ohio Revised Code Section 1521.062, owners of dams must monitor, maintain and operate their dams safely.

Operation and maintenance of the Bottom Ash Pond is regulated by the EPA, ODNR and the OEPA (NPDES Permit). Monitoring requirements under the NPDES permit are discussed below in Section 1.2.7.

---

8 Based on review of DP&L Drawing 400-12-1082 provided by Mr. John Hendrix of DP&L on June 7, 2011.
The Bottom Ash Pond and the surrounding area are operated and maintained by DP&L personnel. A summary of the inspection and maintenance items listed in DP&L’s OMI (as provided to GZA) is provided below.

- After heavy rainfall events (such as 2-inches in a 24-hour period) based on monitoring of rainfall totals at NOAA and the National Weather Service, inspection of flow through overflow pipe and inspection of water level in ponds;

- Monitoring of the items associated with the NPDES Permit in accordance with the permitted frequencies, which range from daily to quarterly (refer to Section 1.2.7);

- Monthly inspections of flow through overflow pipe, flow through overflow structure between ponds, water level in ponds, presence of seepage and/or wet areas, presence of slides and crack, presence of rodent activity and evidence of vandalism;

- Semi-annual vegetation management including mowing grass on embankments and cutting woody growth and inspection and lubrication of the pond drain valve mechanism;

- Annual vegetation management including mowing grass on embankments and cutting woody growth. Additionally, inspection of the condition of the embankments, slope protection, outfall discharge area, visual inspection of the condition of the vertical riser and culvert and inspection of the area surrounding the embankments for evidence of erosion;

- Periodic (every 5 years) inspection of slope protection, conditions of the embankments, outfall discharge to the plunge pool area, visual inspection of the condition of the vertical riser and culvert and inspection of the area surrounding the embankments for evidence of erosion;

- Periodic (every 5 years) safety inspection performed by ODNR;

- Periodic monitoring of the survey monuments for movement of the surface and subsurface [no frequency provided by DP&L]; and,

- On an as needed basis prompt repair of eroded areas, rodent damage and vegetative cover.

Inspection reports produced by ODNR are provided to DP&L. If necessary, these reports may include required remedial measures or other discussion items that require action and/or response by DP&L. The most recent ODNR report is dated July 30, 2008 and describes conditions and observations noted on April 7, 2008. In order to maintain their permit, DP&L is required to address any deficiencies noted in the inspection within 5 years, provide the ODNR with any plans, specifications, investigative reports or other supporting documentation for review and approval prior to construction and provide a record of all repairs in the OMI.
Based on GZA’s discussions with DP&L personnel and a review of the July 30, 2008 ONDR inspection report (refer to Section 1.3.9), it appears that progress toward completing the required remedial measures listed in the July 30, 2008 ODNR report is being made.

1.2.7 Operations and Maintenance of the Fly Ash Pond

Operations and maintenance of the Fly Ash Pond is regulated by the EPA and the OEPA under the same NPDES Permit as the Bottom Ash Pond. According to the NPDES permit, DP&L is required to submit a monthly report to the OEPA that includes NPDES monitoring data. Specifically, at Outfall 001, DP&L is required to record the flow and precipitation daily, collect grab samples for pH, total dissolved residue, total suspended solids, oil and grease, total chloride and total residual chlorine weekly, collect grab samples for dissolved hexavalent chromium monthly and collect grab samples for mercury on a quarterly basis.

The operation and maintenance of the Fly Ash Pond is performed in conjunction with the operation and maintenance of the Bottom Ash Pond. As such, the operation and maintenance activities described in Section 1.2.6 also apply to the Fly Ash Pond and are not repeated in this section.

1.2.8 Size Classification

For the purposes of this EPA-mandated inspection, the size classifications will be based on United States Army Corps of Engineers (COE) criteria. According to guidelines established by the COE, dams with a storage volume between 1,000 and 50,000 acre-feet and/or a height between 40 and 100 feet are classified as Intermediate sized structures. Based on the maximum height of 58 feet and a storage volume of approximately 2,090 acre-feet (at the maximum elevation of approximately 573 feet), the Bottom Ash Pond is classified as an Intermediate sized structure.

Based on the maximum height of 77 feet and a storage volume of approximately 11,350 acre-feet (at the maximum elevation of approximately 573 feet), the Fly Ash Pond is classified as an Intermediate sized structure.

The ODNR considers the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond to be one unit and has assigned a classification of “Class I” based on height (greater than 60 feet) and storage capacity (greater than 5,000 acre-feet).

1.2.9 Hazard Potential Classification

Under the EPA classification system, as presented on page 2 of the EPA checklist (Appendix C) and Definitions section (Appendix B), it is GZA’s opinion that both the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond would be considered as having a High hazard potential. In addition to the potential for economic loss, environmental damage, damage of lifeline facilities (power plant, US 52 etc.) and impact to other concerns including the Ohio River, the hazard potential rating was assigned based on the possibility that loss of human life would occur as a result of failure or misoperation of the ponds, particularly given the proximity of the ponds to the power plant. The overall site plan is shown on Figure 3 and an inundation map is shown on Figure 4.
The ODNR considers the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond to be one unit and has assigned a hazard classification of “Class II” but has assigned an overall (combined size, storage and hazard) “Class I” designation to the ponds.

1.3 Pertinent Engineering Data

1.3.1 Drainage Area

The Bottom Ash Pond is an enclosed embankment built up from the natural ground surface. As such, the contributory drainage area is the surface area of the impoundment, approximately 39 acres.

The Fly Ash Pond is an enclosed embankment built up from the natural ground surface. As such, the primary contributory drainage area is the surface area of the impoundment, approximately 191 acres. The Fly Ash Pond also receives surface stormwater runoff pumped from the coal storage area as well as surface stormwater runoff when the on-Site stormwater collection ponds reach capacity during a significant rain event. The coal storage area and stormwater collection ponds were not visited by GZA during the Fly Ash Pond inspection, and the associated drainage area acreage of these areas was not provided.

1.3.2 Bottom Ash Pond

The Bottom Ash Pond is located adjacent to the Ohio River and is bordered by US-52 to the north-northeast, a low lying field to the southeast, the Ohio River to the southwest, and KEGS to the northwest. The Bottom Ash Pond is separated from the Fly Ash Pond by an interior dike.

The Bottom Ash Pond consists of an earthfill embankment with an impervious fill core and a crest length of approximately 5,075 feet. The maximum crest height (from the lowest toe elevation to the top of embankment) is approximately 58 feet. A road along the top of the crest has a width of approximately 10 feet and a design elevation of approximately 573 feet NGVD 29. Actual crest elevations reportedly range from 572.1 to 573 feet. The Bottom Ash Pond base was reportedly keyed into the existing natural grade (bottom of excavation elevation of 492 feet) which consisted of existing clays and silts. The low permeability of the underlying clays and silts minimizes the potential for wastewater to migrate into the surrounding groundwater. In addition, the pond base was supplemented with a 6 foot thick impervious fill layer to form the pond liner with a top of liner elevation of 498 feet. A 6-foot thick layer of impervious fill was also placed on a portion of the interior slope to tie into the existing natural clay materials. Both the inner and outer slopes of the embankment have a slope of approximately 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical (2.5H:1V). The Bottom Ash Pond has not been expanded since its original construction.

Based on record drawings provided by DP&L, the soil within the embankment consists of an impervious core surrounded by random fill. The hydraulic conductivity of the impervious core and random fill materials was not available. At the crest elevation of 573 feet, the Bottom Ash Pond is estimated to have a surface area of approximately 39 acres and a storage volume of approximately 2,090 acre-feet.
1.3.3 Fly Ash Pond

The Fly Ash Pond is located adjacent to the Ohio River and is bordered by US-52 to the
north-northeast, a low lying field to the southeast, the Ohio River to the southwest, and KEGS to
the northwest. The Fly Ash Pond is separated from the Bottom Ash Pond by an interior dike.

The Fly Ash Pond consists of an earthfill embankment with an impervious fill core and
a crest length of approximately 11,200 feet. The maximum crest height (from the lowest toe
elevation to the top of embankment) is approximately 77 feet, according to DP&L’s draft
Operation, Maintenance and Inspection (OMI) Manual dated May 5, 2010. However,
conflicting information is presented in the April 7, 2008 Dam Safety Inspection Report prepared
by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), which indicates a dam height of 84 feet.
A road along the top of the crest has a width of approximately 10 feet and a design elevation of
approximately 573 feet. Actual crest elevations reportedly range from 572 to 573 feet. The Fly
Ash Pond base was reportedly keyed into the existing natural grade (bottom of excavation
elevation of 498 feet) and supplemented with a layer of impervious fill to form a pond liner with
a thickness ranging from 2 feet near the center of the pond to 6 feet at the toe of the interior
slope. The Fly Ash Pond liner was designed with a top of liner elevation ranging from 500 feet
near the center of the pond to 504 feet at the toe of the interior slope. A 6-foot thick layer of
impervious fill was also placed on a portion of the interior slope to tie into the existing natural
clay materials. Both the inner and outer slopes of the embankment have a slope of
approximately 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical (2.5H:1V). The Fly Ash Pond has not been expanded
since its original construction.

Based on record drawings provided by DP&L, the soil within the embankment consists
of an impervious core surrounded by random fill. The hydraulic conductivity of the impervious
core and random fill materials was not available. At the crest elevation of 573 feet, the Fly Ash
Pond is estimated to have a surface area of approximately 191 acres and a storage volume of
approximately 11,350 acre-feet.

1.3.4 Discharges at the Site

Discharges at the Site are regulated under the previously noted NPDES Permit. Under
normal operating conditions, wastewater outflow from the Bottom Ash Pond to the Fly Ash
Pond is discharged at an average rate of 4.66 MGD. Under normal operating conditions,
wastewater outflow from the Fly Ash Pond to Outfall 001 and thence to the Ohio River is
discharged at an average rate of 7.2 MGD. Values were based on data provided on DP&L’s
water balance diagram.

1.3.5 General Elevations

Bottom Ash Pond elevations presented in this report are taken from design drawings,
reports, and survey monument monitoring data provided by DP&L. Elevations are based upon
the NGVD 29 vertical datum. Actual elevations may be lower than design elevations.

| A. Top of Embankment | ± 573.0 feet |
| B. Normal Operating Pool | ± 569.5 feet |
| C. Top of Pump Station Intake | ± 568.3 feet |
| D. Maximum Elevation of Stop Logs | |
Fly Ash Pond elevations presented in this report are taken from design drawings, reports, and survey monument monitoring data provided by DP&L. Elevations are based upon the NGVD 29 vertical datum.

A. Top of Embankment ± 573.0 feet  
B. Normal Operating Pool ± 568.5 feet  
C. Top of Decant Structure ± 571.74 feet

1.3.6 Design and Construction Records and History of the Bottom Ash Pond

According to the information provided by DP&L, the Bottom Ash Pond was designed by Ebasco Services, Inc. (Ebasco) of Atlanta, Georgia. Construction of the Bottom Ash Pond was completed in 1982. The embankment was constructed to its full height prior to filling it with coal ash wastewater. The origin of the materials comprising the impervious core of the embankments and the impervious blanket of fill over the base of the pond was not specified. Given the reported depth of excavation into the existing grade, it is possible that some portion of the fill material used in construction of the embankments was taken from the native soils. A number of record drawings prepared by Ebasco were provided to GZA for review including drawings, 400-12-1083 and 400-12-1092, which provide details pertaining to the pump station inlet and overflow structures.

1.3.7 Design and Construction Records and History of the Fly Ash Pond

Similar to the Bottom Ash Pond, the Fly Ash Pond was designed by Ebasco. Construction of the Fly Ash Pond was completed in 1982. The embankment was constructed to its full height prior to filling it with coal ash wastewater. The origin of the materials comprising the impervious core of the embankments and the impervious blanket of fill over the base of the pond was not specified. Given the reported depth of excavation into the existing grade, it is possible that some portion of the fill material used in construction of the embankments was taken from the native soils. A number of record drawings prepared by Ebasco were provided to GZA for review including drawing 400-12-1082 which provides details pertaining to the decant structure.

1.3.8 Operating Records

According to a 2009 report prepared by Maysville Survey and Engineering KY LLC (Maysville), ten survey monuments installed around the perimeter of the embankment crest were surveyed to evaluate settlement. The ten survey monuments were surveyed on November 7, 1996 and more recently on February 16, 2009 to monitor horizontal and vertical movement in the top of the embankment. Over the 12 year and 3 month year period, the horizontal movement varied at the survey monuments from approximately 1.8 to 2.4 inches and the vertical movement varied at the survey monuments from approximately 0.05 to 1.0 inches. A table summarizing the horizontal and vertical movement of the survey monuments is provided in Appendix D.

---

Maysville included a note on Sheet 1 of 2 in their report stating the following: "It is unlikely that the north coordinate values for each monument would all shift to the north in this manner. It is possible that the Coal 1 monument used as the base station for the observation has itself shifted over the last 12 years, or the mark placed on the brass disk by DPL is different from the original survey". GZA did not observe any visible indications of significant horizontal displacement of the embankments. The Owner indicated that the embankments have never overtopped or experienced any slope failures.

No other operating records were provided by DP&L.

1.3.9 Previous Inspection Reports

Various types of visual inspections of the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond are conducted by DP&L on a monthly, annual and five-year basis. Informal inspections by the Owner are performed as needed during and after heavy rainfall events, defined by DP&L as two inches or more in a 24 hour period. Records of these inspections are maintained internally. In addition, DP&L contracts with a Registered Professional Engineer to perform an inspection every five years. According to a March 27, 2009 letter from DP&L to USEPA, an inspection of the safety (i.e., structural integrity) of the embankments was conducted by Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc. (CEC) in February 2009. A copy of this report was not provided for review.

The ODNR performs an inspection every five years and prepares a report including remedial measures that is provided to DP&L. A representative from ODNR was on-site during a portion of the assessment but was not available to stay for the entire day. The most recent ODNR inspection was performed on April 7, 2008. Key observations and recommendations resulting from this inspection included:

1. Remove the brush and saplings from (1) the lower portion of the north exterior slope of the Bottom Ash Pond, (2) the north interior slope of the Bottom Ash Pond, and (3) the “T” drains that are located around both ponds. Seed all disturbed areas to establish a proper grass cover.

2. Replenish the displaced riprap and repair erosion along the west interior slope of the Bottom Ash Pond and the south interior slope of the Fly Ash Pond. It appears that the size of the riprap on these slopes should be increased. Monitor the interior slopes for erosion.

3. Repair the erosion gullies located along the toe areas of both east embankments, and repair the “T” drain located on the benches of both ponds.

4. Repair the ruts in the west embankment crest of the Bottom Ash Pond.

5. Investigate the condition of the low-level sluice gate in the overflow structure of the Fly Ash Cell and make repairs as needed.

6. Install a staff gauge in each cell to allow better monitoring of the water levels.
7. Revise and update the operation, maintenance and inspection manual (OMI) and prepare an emergency action plan (EAP) including an inundation map.

8. Monitor the vertical alignment of the crest of the north embankment of the Bottom Ash Pond yearly for movement or signs of embankment instability. In the event that the settlement monuments are surveyed in the future, survey measurements should be taken along the crest of the north embankment to ensure that the crest elevation is uniform.
2.0 INSPECTION

2.1 Visual Inspection

The KECS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond were inspected on June 7, 2011 by Frank Vetere, P.E., and Matthew Vander Eide, P.G., of GZA. The weather conditions during the inspection were sunny with temperatures above 90 degrees Fahrenheit. The weather during the weeks leading up to GZA’s site visit was wet with higher than normal rainfall. Photographs to document the current conditions of the embankments were taken during the inspection and are included in Appendix E. Underwater areas were not inspected, as this level of investigation was beyond GZA’s scope of services. A copy of the EPA Checklist for both ponds is included in Appendix C.

With respect to our visual inspection, there was no evidence of prior releases, failures, or patchwork observed by GZA.

2.1.1 General Findings

In GZA’s professional opinion, the KECS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond embankments appear to be sound and no immediate remedial action appears to be necessary. However, based on EPA’s inspection criteria, both the Bottom Ash Pond and the Fly Ash Pond impoundments have been given a POOR Condition Rating, because no geotechnical computations were made available to GZA for review. Thus, the stability of the embankments could not be independently verified. Specific concerns are identified in more detail in the sections below.

2.1.2 Bottom Ash Pond (Photos 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10)

An overall Bottom Ash Pond site plan showing the pertinent features, including the location and orientation of photographs provided in Appendix E, is detailed on Figure 3.

2.1.2.1 Outer Embankment Slope (Photos 4, 7, 8)

The outer embankment slope generally appeared to be in good condition. Most portions of the slopes had been mowed recently. Mowing in those areas not completed before GZA’s site visit was reportedly scheduled to be completed in the near future. The trees and brush on the slope near Station 3+00 were cut and being removed during GZA’s site visit. Stumps resulting from this area that are 4-inch in diameter or larger should also be removed. No unusual movement or sloughing was observed in the slope.

2.1.2.2 Crest (Photos 3, 4, 9)

The crest of the Bottom Ash Pond has a gravel cover that serves as an access road around the entire perimeter of the pond. The alignment of the top of the embankment appeared generally level, with no depressions or irregularities observed. An elevation survey along the crest by a Professional Surveyor would be required to further evaluate the actual alignment of the top of the embankment.
2.1.2.3 Interior of Embankment (Photos 2, 3, 9, 10)

The interior embankment slope generally appeared to be in good condition. As a result of the bottom ash filling operations near the Bottom Ash Inlet (Figure 3), the area in vicinity of Station 3+00 to 5+00 was observed to have limited freeboard (Photo 9). As of December 31, 2008, DP&L reported that approximately 1,036,074 tons of material was stored in the Bottom Ash Pond, which has an estimated capacity of 3,729,321 tons.

2.1.2.4 Appurtenant Structures (Photos 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)

There are two discharge structures in the Bottom Ash Pond, the pump station inlet structure (Photo 2) and the overflow structure (Photos 5 and 6). Both of these structures were observed to be in good condition and clear of debris. The concrete visible above the water surface in both structures appeared intact. The interior of the pump station inlet structure could not be observed to evaluate sluice gates, piping or other features. The transfer pipes associated with the pump station inlet structure are sub-grade and could not be visually inspected during the assessment. However, DP&L reportedly has never had an issue with any of the discharge pipes since the Bottom Ash Pond was originally constructed. The stoplogs on the overflow structure appeared to be in good condition.

2.1.3 Fly Ash Pond (Photos 11 through 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28)

A Site plan showing the key features of the Fly Ash Pond, including the location and orientation of photographs provided in Appendix E, is provided as Figure 3.

2.1.3.1 Outer Embankment Slope (Photos 11, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28)

The outer embankment slope generally appeared to be in good condition. The upper 20 to 30 feet of the outer embankment slope had been mowed recently. Mowing in those areas not completed before GZA’s site visit was reportedly scheduled to be completed in the near future. Three areas at or near the toe of the embankment were observed to be wet. One area, near Station 88+00 (Photo 18), occupied an area measuring approximately 30 feet by 15 feet and according to DP&L personnel, is typically present in the fall. The second area, near Station 80+00 (Photo 27), was obscured by un-mowed vegetation but according to DP&L personnel, this area is typically wet in the fall and is partly due to ruts caused by mowing activities that allow precipitation to collect. The third wet area, observed between Stations 36+00 and 39+00 (Photo 28), had standing water in a rut that was presumably created during a previous mowing operation. No unusual movement or sloughing was observed in the slope.

Some established vegetation in the form of trees and brush was observed on the lower portion and toe of the outer embankment slope near the outfall structure (Photo 26).

2.1.3.2 Crest (Photos 15, 16, 19, 20, 21)

The crest of the Bottom Ash Pond has a gravel cover that serves as an access road around the entire perimeter of the pond. The alignment of the top of the embankment appeared generally level, with no depressions or irregularities observed. An elevation survey along the
2.1.3.3 Interior of Embankment (Photos 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21)

The overall condition of the interior embankment slope generally appeared to be in good condition. However, multiple areas were observed to have vegetation of less than 1-inch in diameter (Photos 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 21). The rip rap present along portions of the interior slope appears to vary in size and is undersized in some locations as noted in the most recent ODNR report (Photos 19 and 20). Additionally, sloughing and apparent benching of the rip rap in the vicinity of Station 60+00 was observed (Photo 20). As of December 31, 2008 DP&L reported that approximately 4,144,298 tons of material was stored in the Bottom Ash Pond, which has an estimated capacity of 21,566,007 tons.

2.1.3.4 Appurtenant Structures (Photos 23, 24, 25, 26)

The decant structure is the only discharge structure located within the Fly Ash Pond (Photos 23, 24, and 25). This structure was observed to be in good condition and clear of debris, and the concrete visible above the water surface appeared intact. A staff gauge (Photos 23 and 24) was present on the exterior portion of the decant structure and was observed to be clean and in good condition. The interior of the decant structure could not be observed to evaluate sluice gates, piping or other features. The transfer pipes associated with the pump station inlet structure are below grade and could not be visually inspected during the assessment. However, DP&L reportedly has never had an issue with any of the discharge pipes since the Fly Ash Pond was originally constructed. Water from the decant structure is ultimately discharged to an energy dissipater (Photo 26) and Parshall flume that ultimately discharges to the Ohio River in accordance with DP&L’s existing NPDES permit. The energy dissipater and Parshall flume were observed to be in good condition.

2.2 Caretaker Interview

Maintenance of the Bottom Ash and Fly Ash Ponds is the responsibility of DP&L personnel. As detailed in previous sections, GZA met with DP&L personnel and discussed the current operations and maintenance procedures, regulatory requirements, and the history of the Bottom Ash and Fly Ash Ponds since they were constructed.

2.3 Operation and Maintenance Procedures

As discussed in Sections 1.2.6 and 1.2.7, DP&L personnel are responsible for the regular operation and maintenance of the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond. DP&L has developed internal inspection forms that are to be completed upon completion of the various inspections that are scheduled to be performed each month, year or five-year period. Forms listed in DP&L’s draft operation, maintenance and inspection plan include rainfall monitoring, monthly monitoring, annual monitoring, dam maintenance record, dam structure in-depth monitoring and ONDR’s dam inspection checklist.

Routine maintenance procedures also include monitoring and sampling of the outfall from the Fly Ash Pond in accordance with the existing NPDES permit.
2.4 Emergency Action Plan

In accordance with Rule 1501:21-21-04 of the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC), owners of dams must prepare and maintain an emergency action plan (EAP). Further, Rule 1501:21-21-04 states the following: “The emergency action plan shall be updated on at least an annual basis including updating all emergency contact information. The owner or the owner’s representative shall meet with the local county emergency management director annually to review and update the plan. The owner shall annually submit to the division updated pages of the emergency action plan including a signature page from the county director indicating that the annual update meeting occurred and that the county director received a copy of the updated pages of the plan.”

At the time of GZA’s site visit, DP&L was currently in the process of revising their EAP as evidenced by the draft document dated May 15, 2011 and the inundation map provided to GZA by DP&L. Select components of the inundation map produced by Buckeye Engineering, LTD. And dated June 10, 2010 have been overlain on an aerial photo for reference on Figure 4.

Review of DP&L’s draft revised EAP indicates that emergency detection, evaluation, classification, notification, contact information and procedures are addressed and provided in the plan.

2.5 Hydrologic/Hydraulic Data

GZA did not perform an independent assessment of the hydraulics and hydrology for the embankments, as this was beyond the scope of services. However, we did review available design documentation for the Bottom Ash and Fly Ash Ponds.

According to an as-built drawing provided by DP&L, the design crest elevation of both the Bottom Ash and Fly Ash Ponds is 573 feet. The normal pool elevation for the Bottom Ash Pond is 569.5 feet and the normal pool elevation for the Fly Ash Pond is 568.5 feet. Subtracting the normal pool elevations from the design crest elevation results in a freeboard of 3.5 feet for the Bottom Ash Pond and 4.5 feet for the Fly Ash Pond. Actual crest elevations vary, as discussed in Sections 1.3.2 and 1.3.3, and have been reported as low as 572.1 feet for the Bottom Ash Pond, which results in a freeboard of 2.6 feet.

OAC Rule 1501:21-13-07 states that “For class I and class II dams that are upground reservoirs, the minimum elevation of the top of the dam shall be at least five feet higher than the elevation of the designed maximum operating pool level unless otherwise approved by the chief”. According to DP&L and ONDR representatives, DP&L has filed for a variance to this rule which would decrease the minimum freeboard at this dam from 5 feet to 3 feet.

2.6 Structural and Seepage Stability

The original structural and seepage stability analyses, if any, were not available to GZA at the time of inspection. Slope stability analyses, seepage analyses, foundation liquefaction analyses, and settlement analyses reports were not available.
3.0 ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Assessments

In GZA’s professional opinion, the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond embankments appear to be sound and no immediate remedial action appears to be necessary, based upon the information provided and our observations. However, based on EPA’s inspection criteria, the overall condition of both the KEGS Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond is judged to be **POOR** because no geotechnical computations were made available to GZA for review. Thus, the stability of the embankments could not be independently verified.

The Bottom Ash Pond was found to have the following deficiencies:

1. Portions of the outer embankment slopes had not been mowed recently;
2. No instrumentation (i.e., staff gauge) to observe the elevation of the water within the pond/impoundment;
3. Presence of undersized rip rap on portions of the interior embankment;
4. Presence of vegetation on the interior slope of the embankment;
5. Timber from recent vegetation clearing near Station 3+00 remains on the outer embankments slope;
6. DP&L personnel was unsure if the discharge pipes from the pump station inlet structure to the ash water pumps have been inspected internally since they were installed;
7. Limited freeboard in the vicinity of Station 3+00 to 5+00; and,
8. Reported crest and normal pool elevations indicate potential for non-compliance with state freeboard requirement of five feet for Class I dams.

The Fly Ash Pond was found to have the following deficiencies:

1. With the exception of the upper 20 to 30 feet, a majority of the outer embankment slopes had not been mowed recently;
2. Presence of undersized rip rap on portions of the interior embankment;
3. Apparent benching of the interior embankments slopes in the vicinity of Station 60+00;
4. Presence of vegetation on the interior slope of the embankment;
5. Presence of wet areas at or near the toe of the outer embankment slopes between Stations 36+00 to 39+00 and in the vicinity of Stations 80+00 and 88+00;
6. DP&L personnel was unsure if the discharge pipes from the decant structure to the outfall have been inspected internally since they were installed;
7. Reported crest and normal pool elevations indicate potential for non-compliance with state freeboard requirement of five feet for Class I dams; and,
8. Presence of established vegetation near the lower portion and toe of the outer embankment slopes near the outfall structure.

The following recommendations and remedial measures generally describe the recommended approach to address current deficiencies. Prior to undertaking recommended maintenance, repairs, or remedial measures, the applicability of environmental permits needs to be determined for activities that may occur within resource areas under the jurisdiction of the appropriate regulatory agencies.
3.2 Studies and Analyses

GZA recommends the following studies and analyses:

1. Survey of the crest of both ponds by a licensed Professional Surveyor to evaluate the current elevation profile of the crest and confirm that survey monuments are not moving horizontally;
2. Install piezometers/observation wells in the noted wet areas (between Stations 36+00 to 39+00 and in the vicinity of Stations 80+00 and 88+00) to evaluate water levels, and possibly water chemistry, in these areas. This activity may require consultation and/or design by a licensed Professional Engineer;
3. Based on data from piezometers/observation wells, perform a seepage analysis and assess need for subsurface toe drainage in wet locations and make improvements as needed;
4. Resolve pending variance with ODNR regarding reducing the minimum freeboard requirement from five feet to three feet;
5. Provide or perform spillway analysis to demonstrate capacity of discharge structures to accommodate the regulatory Spillway Design Flood with the proposed normal pool freeboard; and,
6. Provide or perform a slope stability analysis for the embankments. Analysis should include assessment of upstream slope stability in light of observed movement of riprap. Analysis may require a subsurface exploration program to develop appropriate input data. Most recent inspection should be provided to the EPA for review.

3.3 Recurrent Operation & Maintenance Recommendations

GZA recommends the following operation and maintenance level activities:

1. Clear vegetation from the interior embankment slopes of both ponds;
2. Remove stumps that are 4-inches or more in diameter resulting from the removal of trees and brush on the outer embankment near Station 3+00;
3. Install a staff gauge on or near the pump station inlet structure in order to take periodic measurements of the Bottom Ash Pond water surface elevation;
4. Inspect each of the piezometers around the toe of the pond embankments and ensure each piezometer has a cap, lockable protective cover/casing and is visible during mowing operations;
5. Ensure each survey monument is protected and is visible during mowing operations;
6. If DP&L has the opportunity to stop discharging from the Bottom Ash Pond for a limited time period, inspect the discharge pipes from the pump station inlet structure to the ash water pumps to verify that they are operating correctly and are in good condition. This may be performed by video photography; and,
7. If DP&L has the opportunity to stop discharging from the Fly Ash Pond for a limited time period, inspect the discharge pipes from the decant structure to the outfall structure to verify that they are operating correctly and are in good condition. This may be performed by video photography.
3.4 Repair Recommendations

GZA recommends the following repairs which may improve the overall condition of the Bottom Ash Pond, but do not alter the current design of the embankment. The recommendations may require design by a licensed Professional Engineer and construction contractor experienced in embankment construction.

1. Clear the area of established vegetation near the lower portion and toe of the outer embankment slopes near the outfall structure; and,
2. Restore riprap in sections where displacement has occurred.

3.5 Alternatives

There are no practical alternatives to the repairs itemized above.
4.0 ENGINEER’S CERTIFICATION

I acknowledge that the management units referenced herein, the Killen Electric Generating Station Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond, have been assessed to be in POOR condition, based on EPA’s inspection criteria, on June 7, 2011.

Frank Vetere, P.E.
Senior Project Manager
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Appendix A

Limitations
DAM ENGINEERING & VISUAL INSPECTION LIMITATIONS

1. The observations described in this report were made under the conditions stated herein. The conclusions presented in the report were based solely on the services described therein, and not on scientific tasks or procedures beyond the scope of described services or the time and budgetary constraints imposed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

2. In preparing this report, GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. (GZA) has relied on certain information provided by the Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L) (and their affiliates) as well as Federal, state, and local officials and other parties referenced therein. GZA has also relied on certain information contained on the State of Ohio’s website as well as Federal, state, and local officials and other parties which were available to GZA at the time of the inspection. Although there may have been some degree of overlap in the information provided by these various sources, GZA did not attempt to independently verify the accuracy or completeness of all information reviewed or received during the course of this work.

3. In reviewing this Report, it should be noted that the reported condition of the Ash Ponds is based on observations of field conditions during the course of this study along with data made available to GZA. The observations of conditions at the Ash Ponds reflect only the situation present at the specific moment in time the observations were made, under the specific conditions present. It may be necessary to reevaluate the recommendations of this report when subsequent phases of evaluation or repair and improvement provide more data.

4. It is important to note that the condition of a dam or embankment depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam or embankment will continue to represent the condition of the dam or embankment at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that unsafe conditions may be detected.

5. Water level readings have been reviewed and interpretations have been made in the text of this report. Fluctuations in the level of the groundwater and surface water may occur due to variations in rainfall, temperature, and other factors different than at the time measurements were made.

6. GZA’s comments on the history, hydrology, hydraulics, and embankment stability for the Ash Ponds are based on a limited review of available design documentation for the Killen Electric Generating Station. Calculations and computer modeling used in these analyses were not available and were not independently reviewed by GZA.

7. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of EPA for specific application to the existing dam facilities, in accordance with generally accepted dam engineering practices. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

8. This dam inspection verification report has been prepared for this project by GZA. This report is for broad evaluation and management purposes only and is not sufficient, in and of itself, to prepare construction documents or an accurate bid.

9. The Phase I investigation does not include an assessment of the need for fences, gates, no-trespassing signs, repairs to existing fences and railings and other items which may be needed to minimize trespass and provide greater security for the facility and safety to the public. An evaluation of the project for compliance with OSHA rules and regulations is also excluded.
Appendix B

Definitions
COMMON DAM SAFETY DEFINITIONS

For a comprehensive list of dam engineering terminology and definitions refer to references published by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation, or the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Orientation

Upstream – Shall mean the side of the dam that borders the impoundment.

Downstream – Shall mean the high side of the dam, the side opposite the upstream side.

Right – Shall mean the area to the right when looking in the downstream direction.

Left – Shall mean the area to the left when looking in the downstream direction.

Dam Components

Dam – Shall mean any artificial barrier, including appurtenant works, which impounds or diverts water.

Embankment – Shall mean the fill material, usually earth or rock, placed with sloping sides, such that it forms a permanent barrier that impounds water.

Crest – Shall mean the top of the dam, usually provides a road or path across the dam.

Abutment – Shall mean that part of a valley side against which a dam is constructed. An artificial abutment is sometimes constructed as a concrete gravity section, to take the thrust of an arch dam where there is no suitable natural abutment.

Appurtenant Works – Shall mean structures, either in dams or separate there from, including but not be limited to, spillways; reservoirs and their rims; low level outlet works; and water conduits including tunnels, pipelines, or penstocks, either through the dams or their abutments.

Spillway – Shall mean a structure over or through which water flows are discharged. If the flow is controlled by gates or boards, it is a controlled spillway; if the fixed elevation of the spillway crest controls the level of the impoundment, it is an uncontrolled spillway.

General

EAP – Emergency Action Plan - Shall mean a predetermined plan of action to be taken to reduce the potential for property damage and/or loss of life in an area affected by an impending dam break.


Normal Pool – Shall mean the elevation of the impoundment during normal operating conditions.

Acre-foot – Shall mean a unit of volumetric measure that would cover one acre to a depth of one foot. It is equal to 43,560 cubic feet. One million U.S. gallons = 3.068 acre feet.
Height of Dam – Shall mean the vertical distance from the lowest portion of the natural ground, including any stream channel, along the downstream toe of the dam to the crest of the dam.

Spillway Design Flood (SDF) – Shall mean the flood used in the design of a dam and its appurtenant works particularly for sizing the spillway and outlet works, and for determining maximum temporary storage and height of dam requirements.

**Condition Rating**

Satisfactory - No existing or potential management unit safety deficiencies are recognized. Acceptable performance is expected under all applicable loading conditions (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable criteria. Minor maintenance items may be required.

Fair - Acceptable performance is expected under all required loading conditions (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable safety regulatory criteria. Minor deficiencies may exist that require remedial action and/or secondary studies or investigations.

Poor - A management unit safety deficiency is recognized for any required loading condition (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable dam safety regulatory criteria. Remedial action is necessary. POOR also applies when further critical studies or investigations are needed to identify any potential dam safety deficiencies.

Unsatisfactory - Considered unsafe. A dam safety deficiency is recognized that requires immediate or emergency remedial action for problem resolution. Reservoir restrictions may be necessary.

**Hazard Potential**

(In the event the impoundment should fail, the following would occur):

Less than Low Hazard Potential: Failure or misoperation of the dam results in no probable loss of human life or economic or environmental losses.

Low Hazard Potential: Dams assigned the low hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the owner’s property.

Significant Hazard Potential: Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard potential classification dams are often located in predominantly rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure.

High Hazard Potential: Dams assigned the high hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life.
Appendix C

Inspection Checklists
Check the appropriate box below. Provide comments when appropriate. If not applicable or not available, record "N/A". Any unusual conditions or construction practices that should be noted in the comments section. For large diked embankments, separate checklists may be used for different embankment areas. If separate forms are used, identify approximate area that the form applies to in comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?</td>
<td>Semi-Annual</td>
<td>18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pool elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>569.5 feet</td>
<td>19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decant inlet elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>569.5 feet*</td>
<td>20. Decant Pipes:</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>565.0 feet</td>
<td>Is water entering inlet, but not exiting outlet?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>572.1 feet</td>
<td>Is water exiting outlet, but not entering inlet?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Is water exiting outlet flowing clear?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the embankment currently under construction?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation, stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>From underdrain?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>At isolated points on embankment slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cracks or scarps on crest?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>At natural hillside in the embankment area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Over widespread areas?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>From downstream foundation area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>&quot;Boils&quot; beneath stream or ponded water?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Around the outside of the decant pipe?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>23. Water against downstream toe?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major adverse changes in these items could cause instability and should be reported for further evaluation. Adverse conditions noted in these items should normally be described (extent, location, volume, etc.) in the space below and on the back of this sheet.**

**Inspection Issue #**

3) Decant inlet is open channel spillway leading to fly ash pond. Bottom elevation of stop logs is reported at 565.0 feet, top of stop logs reported at an elevation of 569.5 feet.

8) According to construction drawings, foundation preparation was performed

9) Some minor vegetation (<1-inch diameter) observed on upstream slopes; maintenance addresses periodically. Some trees (>6-inch diameter) on southwestern downstream slope, near out fall structure.

23) Southeastern berm is dividing dike between fly ash pond and bottom ash pond.
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency

Coal Combustion Waste (CCW)
Impoundment Inspection

Impoundment NPDES Permit # OH0060046

Date June 7, 2011

Impoundment Name Killen Electric Generating Station Bottom Ash Pond
Impoundment Company Dayton Power and Light Company
EPA Region 5
State Agency (Field Office) Address 2045 Morse Road, Bldg. B-2
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Name of Impoundment Killen Station Bottom Ash Pond
(Report each impoundment on a separate form under the same Impoundment NPDES Permit number)

New X Update ________

Yes No

Is impoundment currently under construction? X
Is water or ccw currently being pumped into the impoundment? X

IMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION: Storage of bottom ash sluice

Nearest Downstream Town: Name Concord, KY
Distance from the impoundment 0.98 miles

Impoundment Location: Longitude 83° 28' 5'' Seconds
Latitude 38° 41' 22'' Seconds
State OH County Adams

Does a state agency regulate this impoundment? YES X NO

If So Which State Agency? Ohio DNR Division of Water I.D. 8533-001
HAZARD POTENTIAL (In the event the impoundment should fail, the following would occur):

____ LESS THAN LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Failure or misoperation of the dam results in no probable loss of human life or economic or environmental losses.

____ LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the low hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the owner’s property.

____ SIGNIFICANT HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard potential classification dams are often located in predominantly rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure.

____ X HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the high hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life.

DESCRIBE REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

In addition to the potential for economic loss, environmental damage, damage of lifeline facilities (plant, US 52) and impact to other concerns including the Ohio River, it is possible that loss of human life would occur as a result of failure of misoperation of the dam. The losses would be primarily limited to the owner’s property, but the Ohio River is located less than 500 feet from the southern dike and could receive water and/or ash from the impoundment. Further, the Ohio DNR has classified the impoundment as "Class I" based on height and storage capacity.
CONFIGURATION:

Cross-Valley

Side-Hill

Diked

Incised

Cross-Valley

Side-Hill

Diked

Incised

Embankment Height 84 feet
Pool Area 39.2 acres
Current Freeboard 2.6 feet

Embankment Material Compacted clay
Liner Compacted clay
Liner Permeability unknown

Minimum freeboard is 5 feet according to ODNR; plant is seeking a variance to decrease minimum freeboard to 3 feet. Current freeboard based on top of stop log elevation 569.5 feet and reported lowest crest elevation of crest 572.1 feet.
TYPE OF OUTLET (Mark all that apply)

_____ Open Channel Spillway
_____ Trapezoidal
_____ Triangular
X Rectangular (conveys water from bottom ash pond to fly ash pond)
_____ Irregular

7. 75 ft depth
10 ft bottom (or average) width
10 ft top width

X Outlet (Provides make-up water to plant)

72 in inside diameter (36-inch ductile iron pipe present inside 72-inch CMP)

Material
X corrugated metal
_____ welded steel
_____ concrete
_____ plastic (hdpe, pvc, etc.)
X other (specify) ductile iron pipe

Is water flowing through the outlet? YES X NO ______

_____ No Outlet

_____ Other Type of Outlet (specify) _______________________________________

The Impoundment was Designed By Ebasco Services, Inc, Atlanta, GA

__________________________________________
Has there ever been a failure at this site?  YES __________  NO  \(\times\) 

If So When?  ____________________________

If So Please Describe:  _____________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

EPA Form XXXX-XXX, Jan 09
Has there ever been significant seepages at this site? YES ______ NO ______

If So When? ___________________________

IF So Please Describe: __________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

EPA Form XXXX-XXX, Jan 09
Has there ever been any measures undertaken to monitor/lower Phreatic water table levels based on past seepages or breaches at this site? YES ________NO ________

If so, which method (e.g., piezometers, gw pumping,...)? ____________________

If so Please Describe : ____________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

No past seepages or breaches.
### Site Name: Killen Electric Generating Station  
### Date: June 7, 2011  
### Operator's Name: Dayton Power and Light Company  
### Hazard Potential Classification: High  
### Inspector's Name: Frank Vetere, P.E. & Matt Vander Eide, P.G.

Check the appropriate box below. Provide comments when appropriate. If not applicable or not available, record "N/A." Any unusual conditions or construction practices that should be noted in the comments section. For large diked embankments, separate checklists may be used for different embankment areas. If separate forms are used, identify approximate area that the form applies to in comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pool elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>Semi-Annual</td>
<td>18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decant inlet elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20. Decant Pipes:</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?</td>
<td>572.0 feet</td>
<td>21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the embankment currently under construction?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>23. Water against downstream toe?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation, stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>From underdrain?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>At isolated points on embankment slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cracks or scarps on crest?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>At natural hillside in the embankment area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Over widespread areas?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>From downstream foundation area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>&quot;Boils&quot; beneath stream or ponded water?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Around the outside of the decant pipe?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>23. Water against downstream toe?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major adverse changes in these items could cause instability and should be reported for further evaluation. Adverse conditions noted in these items should normally be described (extent, location, volume, etc.) in the space below and on the back of this sheet.**

**Inspection Issue #**  
**Comments**

2) Staff gauge present on outflow structure indicated an approximate elevation of 566.24 feet during site visit (top of outflow structure = 571.74 feet, staff gauge reading = approximately 5.5 feet below top of outflow structure). Design "normal pool" elevation is reported as 568.5 feet.  
3) Pool elevation is set by a weir with top of concrete elevation of 567.25 feet. An adjustable steel plate is present to vary pool elevation.  
8) According to construction drawings, foundation preparation was performed.  
9) Some minor vegetation (<1-inch diameter) observed on upstream slopes; maintenance addresses periodically. Some trees (>6-inch diameter) on southwestern downstream slope, near out fall structure.  
18) Benching from rip rap sloughing observed in multiple areas of upstream slopes.  
19) Rip rap on upstream slopes is under sized in some areas.  
21) Three isolated areas of surface water ponding were observed: one at toe of southern downstream slope between stations 85+00 and 90+00, one on eastern downstream slope between stations 65+00 and 80+00 and one at toe of northern downstream slope between stations 35+00 and 40+00. Owner was aware of these areas and stated that some areas are wet in spring and fall. Some of the water seems to be collecting in ruts caused by mowing operations and could be due, in part, to recent excessive rainfall.  
23) Water was observed against the downstream toe in three areas during the inspection (see comment no. 21) as a result, in part, of recent heavy precipitation. Two areas observed are reportedly present during both spring and fall inspections performed by the Owner. Northwestern berm is dividing dike between fly ash pond and bottom ash pond.
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency

Coal Combustion Waste (CCW) Impoundment Inspection

Impoundment NPDES Permit # OH0060046
Date June 7, 2011

Impoundment Name Killen Electric Generating Station Fly Ash Pond
Impoundment Company Dayton Power and Light Company
EPA Region 5
State Agency (Field Office) Address 2045 Morse Road, Bldg. B-2 Columbus, Ohio 43229

Name of Impoundment Killen Station Fly Ash Pond
(Report each impoundment on a separate form under the same Impoundment NPDES Permit number)

New X Update ______

Is impoundment currently under construction? ______ Yes ______ No ______
Is water or ccw currently being pumped into the impoundment? ______ Yes ______ No ______

IMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION: Storage of fly ash sluice

Nearest Downstream Town: Name Concord, KY
Distance from the impoundment 0.98 miles

Impoundment Location:
Longitude 83 Degrees 28 Minutes 5 Seconds
Latitude 38 Degrees 41 Minutes 22 Seconds
State OH County Adams

Does a state agency regulate this impoundment? YES X NO ______
If So Which State Agency? Ohio DNR Division of Water I.D. 8533-001
HAZARD POTENTIAL  (In the event the impoundment should fail, the following would occur):

_____ LESS THAN LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Failure or misoperation of the dam results in no probable loss of human life or economic or environmental losses.

_____ LOW HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the low hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses. Losses are principally limited to the owner’s property.

_____ SIGNIFICANT HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, disruption of lifeline facilities, or can impact other concerns. Significant hazard potential classification dams are often located in predominantly rural or agricultural areas but could be located in areas with population and significant infrastructure.

_____ X HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL: Dams assigned the high hazard potential classification are those where failure or misoperation will probably cause loss of human life.

DESCRIPT REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

In addition to the potential for economic loss, environmental damage, damage of lifeline facilities (plant, US 52) and impact to other concerns including the Ohio River, it is possible that loss of human life would occur as a result of failure of misoperation of the dam. The losses would be primarily limited to the owner’s property, but the Ohio River is located less than 500 feet from the southern dike and could receive water and/or ash from the impoundment. Further, the Ohio DNR has classified the impoundment as “Class I” based on height and storage capacity.
CONFIGURATION:

CROSS-VALLEY

SIDE-HILL

DIKED

INCISED

_____ Cross-Valley  
_____ Side-Hill  
X Diked  
_____ Incised (form completion optional)  
_____ Combination Incised/Diked

Embankment Height 84 feet  
Pool Area 191.4 acres  
Current Freeboard approx. 5.76 feet

Embankment Material Compacted clay  
Liner Compacted  
Liner Permeability unknown

* Minimum freeboard is 5 feet according to ODNR; plant is seeking a variance to decrease minimum freeboard to 3 feet. Current freeboard based on approximate reading of staff gauge at outflow structure and reported elevation of top of outflow structure of 571.74 feet.
**TYPE OF OUTLET** (Mark all that apply)

- Open Channel Spillway
- Trapezoidal
- Triangular
- Rectangular
- Irregular

- depth
- bottom (or average) width
- top width

**TRAPEZOIDAL**

**TRIANGULAR**

**RECTANGULAR**

**IRREGULAR**

- **Outlet**

72 in inside diameter (36-inch ductile iron pipe present inside 72-inch CMP)

Material

- corrugated metal
- welded steel
- concrete
- plastic (hdpe, pvc, etc.)
- other (specify) ductile iron pipe

Is water flowing through the outlet? YES _____ NO _______

- **No Outlet**

- **Other Type of Outlet** (specify) ________________________________

The Impoundment was Designed By ________

Ebasco Services, Inc., Atlanta, GA

-----------------------------------------------
Has there ever been a failure at this site? YES __________ NO _____
If So When? ___________________________
If So Please Describe: ________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
Has there ever been significant seepages at this site?  YES ______ NO ______
If So When? __________________________
IF So Please Describe: __________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Has there ever been any measures undertaken to monitor/lower Phreatic water table levels based on past seepages or breaches at this site? YES ________ NO ________

If so, which method (e.g., piezometers, gw pumping,...)? ____________________

If so Please Describe:  No past seepages or breaches. ____________________

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
Appendix D

Survey Monument Settlement Measurements
APPENDIX D

SURVEY MONUMENT SETTLEMENT MEASUREMENTS
DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
KILLEN ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION
MANCHESTER, OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Monument ID</th>
<th>Settlement/Movement Between November 7, 1996 and February 16, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM1</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM3</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM4</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM5</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM6</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM7</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM8</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM9</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM10</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Data shown above was obtained by GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. from a report prepared by Maysville Surveying & Engineering KY, LLC entitled "Killen Electric Generating Station Ash Pond Settlement Monument Survey Project" and dated February 23, 2009.
2. The values shown for the change in north coordinates were accompanied by the following note in the above referenced report: "It is unlikely that the north coordinate values for each monument would all shift to the north in this manner. It is possible that the Coal 1 monument used as the base station for the observation has itself shifted over the last 12 years, or the mark placed on the brass disk by DPL is different from the original survey."
3. All values shown in feet.
Appendix E

Photographs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Direction Photo Taken</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Discharge into Bottom Ash Pond. Blue pipes carry bottom ash, cooling tower blow down is seen below the pipes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>View of Bottom Ash Pond and pump station intake structure. Killen Generating Station shown in the background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Interior berm separating the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond. Blue pipes at right carry liquids for discharge into the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>View of typical exterior slope of Bottom Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>View of overflow structure between the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond. Structure contains stop logs to control Bottom Ash Pond water level. Pipe shown in picture carries liquids from the Plant Drain to the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>View looking at Bottom Ash Pond through (beneath) overflow structure between the Bottom Ash Pond and Fly Ash Pond. Structure contains stop logs to control Bottom Ash Pond water level. Pipe shown in picture carries liquids from the Plant Drain to the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>West-Northwest</td>
<td>Inspection of T-Drain at toe of exterior slope of Bottom Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 4+50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>West-Northwest</td>
<td>T-Drain at toe of exterior slope of Bottom Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 4+50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>View of interior slope of the west-northwest dike of Bottom Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 3+00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>View of interior slope of the west-northwest dike of Bottom Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 11+00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of typical survey monument (beneath white protective cover).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>View of typical monitoring well at toe of exterior slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Discharge into the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Discharge of Plant Drain into the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of interior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 119+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>South-Southwest</td>
<td>View of vegetation growth on interior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 110+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>North-Northwest</td>
<td>Vegetation growth on interior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 105+00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>View of wet area at toe of exterior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 88+00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>View of rip rap on the interior slope of the Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 81+00. Note the variable size of stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of rip rap on the interior slope of the Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 60+00. Note the variable size of stone and apparent benching of the slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>View of exterior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 40+00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>View of residential properties located on the northern sided of US-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of decant structure in the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of decant structure in the Fly Ash Pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of water from Fly Ash Pond entering the decant structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>View of outfall from Fly Ash Pond through energy dissipater and Parshall flume. Note presence of tree and brush growth on lower portion and toe of exterior slope of Fly Ash Pond in the background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Direction Photo Taken</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>View of a portion of the wet area observed midway between the crest and toe of the exterior slope of the Fly Ash pond in the vicinity of Station 80+00. Wet area occurs at the junction of the southeastern berm and the southwestern berm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>06/07/11</td>
<td>Northeast, towards US-52</td>
<td>View of a wet spot, with standing water, at the toe of the exterior slope of the Fly Ash Pond in the vicinity of Station 38+00. Stormwater ditch with tree growth is in visible in the background.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Selected Engineering Drawings Provided by DP&L
Disclaimer:
Many assumptions were made in preparing the mapping. Actual conditions during a failure may be different than those assumed in preparing the mapping. The limits of flooding shown on the maps and the tabular data presented should be used only as a guideline for establishing areas needing evacuation. Actual areas inundated will depend on actual flooding and failure conditions and may differ, perhaps substantially, from the areas shown on the maps.