INFORMATION REQUEST	1982 Pond RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
1. Relative to the National Inventory of Dams criteria for High, Significant, Low, or Less-than-Low Hazard Potential, please provide the potential hazard rating for each management unit and indicate who established the rating, what the basis of the rating is, and what federal or state agency regulates the unit(s). If the unit(s) does not have a rating, please note that fact.	Hazard Classification – High. A professional engineering firm established the rating based on USCOE guidelines and NCDENR Regulations. The unit is under the purview of the North Carolina Utilities Commission.	Hazard Classification – High. A professional engineering firm established the rating based on USCOE guidelines and NCDENR Regulations. The unit is under the purview of the North Carolina Utilities Commission.
2. What year was each management unit commissioned and expanded?	Commissioned in 1982. Original design not expanded. Additional ash storage capacity provided within original ash pond area in 2006 by dredging and restacking.	Commissioned in 1964. In 1970 the dam was raised approximately 30 feet. In 1982 the unit was removed from service and drained. In 2000 the unit received dredged ash from 1982 pond. In 2006 a constructed wetlands treatment system was constructed within the unit boundary to treat flue gas emission control wastewater and is currently in operation.

Coll #1

INFORMATION REQUEST	1982 Pond RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
3. What materials are temporarily or permanently contained in the unit? Use the following categories to respond to this question: (1) fly ash; (2) bottom ash; (3) boiler slag; (4) flue gas emission control residuals; (5) other. If the management unit contains more than one type of material, please identify all that apply. Also, if you identify "other," please specify the other types of materials that are temporarily or permanently contained in the unit(s).	The unit contains fly ash, bottom ash, and boiler slag. Other- Ash sluice water, categorical low volume wastewater, coal pile storm water runoff and other storm water.	The unit contains fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, Flue Gas Emission Control Residuals in the Constructed Wetlands; Other – Storm water.
4. Was the management unit(s) designed by a Professional Engineer? Is or was the construction of the waste management unit(s) under the supervision of a Professional Engineer? Is inspection and monitoring of the safety of the waste management unit(s) under the supervision of a Professional Engineer?	The unit was designed by a professional engineer. The construction was under the supervision of a professional engineer. Some inspections are under the supervision of a professional engineer, some are not. See response to item 5. below.	The unit was designed by a professional engineer. The construction was under the supervision of a professional engineer. Some inspections are under the supervision of a professional engineer, some are not. See response to item 5. below.

INFORMATION REQUEST	198[illegible]nd RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
5. When did the company last assess or evaluate the safety (i.e., structural integrity) of the management unit(s)? Briefly describe the credentials of those conducting the structural integrity assessments/evaluations. Identify actions taken or planned by facility personnel as a result of these assessments or evaluations. If corrective actions were taken, briefly describe the credentials of those performing the corrective actions, whether they were company employees or contractors. If the company plans an assessment or evaluation in the future, when is it expected to occur?	Monthly inspections are conducted by trained plant personnel, following strict procedures that include visual inspections and data gathering to detect any problems at an early stage of development. Attached is a copy of the procedure and the most recent inspection report available. Actions or planned: Animal burrows filled.	Monthly inspections are conducted by trained plant personnel, following strict procedures that include visual inspections and data gathering to detect any problems at an early stage of development. Attached is a copy of the procedure and a copy of the most recent inspection report available. Actions or planned: None taken or planned.

INFORMATION REQUEST	1982 Pond RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
	Annual inspections are conducted by a third-party professional engineering contractor. The engineering firms that conduct the inspections have expertise in geotechnical and civil engineering. Attached is the most recent annual inspection report summary. Actions taken or planned: Animal burrows noted on western portion of embankment. Animals should be removed and the burrows backfilled with tamped earth.	Annual inspections are conducted by a third-party professional engineering contractor. The engineering firms that conduct the inspections have expertise in geotechnical and civil engineering. Attached is the most recent annual inspection report. Actions taken or planned: Because the 1964 Ash Pond Dam currently retains only surface water associated with rainfall runoff (the wetlands treatment ponds are lined), only a cursory inspection of the exterior slope and adjacent natural ground of the former 1964 ash pond was performed. The exterior slope of the dam was observed to be in good condition. The area and volume of seepage, previously noted about 100 feet north of the inactive outlet structure from the former pond, was observed to be about the same as noted during previous inspections. The seepage flow is clear and of no concern relative to embankment stability.

INFORMATION REQUEST	198[illegible]nd RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
	Comprehensive five-year inspections are conducted by a third-party professional engineering contractor. The engineering firms that conduct the inspections have expertise in geotechnical and civil engineering Attached is the most recent comprehensive inspection dated 2007. Actions taken or planned: Continue vegetation control.	Comprehensive five-year inspections are conducted by a third-party professional engineering contractor. The engineering firms that conduct the inspections have expertise in geotechnical and civil engineering. Attached is the most recent comprehensive inspection dated 2007. Actions taken or planned: Continue with vegetation control from face of dam. Visually monitor seepage from old spring at toe of dam.
6. When did a State or a Federal regulatory official last inspect or evaluate the safety (structural integrity) of the management unit(s)? If you are aware of a planned state or federal inspection or evaluation in the future, when is it expected to occur? Please identify the Federal or State regulatory agency or department which conducted or is planning the inspection or evaluation. Please provide a copy of the most recent official inspection report or evaluation.	The North Carolina Utilities Commission requires a five year inspection report. We are not aware of any planned inspections by state or federal officials. Refer to the five year report submitted in response to item 5 above for the most recent official report.	The North Carolina Utilities Commission requires a five year inspection report. We are not aware of any planned inspections by state or federal officials. Refer to the five year report submitted in response to item 5 above for the most recent official report.
7. Have assessments or evaluations, or inspections conducted by State or Federal regulatory officials conducted within the past year uncovered a safety issue(s) with the management unit(s), and, if so, describe the actions that have been or are being taken to deal with the issue or issues. Please provide any documentation that you have for these actions.	There have been no inspections conducted by state or federal official that evaluated the structural integrity other than a visual observation by NPDES inspectors. There have been no follow-up actions.	There have been no inspections conducted by state or federal official that evaluated the structural integrity other than a visual observation by NPDES inspectors. There have been no follow-up actions.

INFORMATION REQUEST	1982 Pond RESPONSE	1964 Pond RESPONSE
8. What is the surface area (acres) and total storage capacity of each of the management units? What is the volume of materials currently stored in each of the management unit(s). Please provide the date that the volume measurement(s) was taken. Please provide the maximum height of the management unit(s). The basis for determining maximum height is explained later in this Enclosure.	Response - The surface area is approximately 46 acres. The total storage capacity is approximately 1,400 acre-feet. The volume of material currently stored is approximately 1,260 acre-feet and was estimated in March 2009. The maximum height of the unit is 95 feet.	The surface area is approximately 45 acres. Our construction records indicate a storage capacity of approximately 1,380 acre-feet. We are unsure of the volume of remaining material since the unit has been altered by the constructed wetlands treatment system and has been the recipient of dredged ash from the active pond as well as a source of marketed ash. The maximum height of the unit is 90 feet.
9. Please provide a brief history of known spills or unpermitted releases from the unit within the last ten years, whether or not these were reported to State or federal regulatory agencies. For purposes of this question, please include only releases to surface water or to the land (do not include releases to groundwater).	There have been no known spills or releases	There have been no known spills or releases
10. Please identify all current legal owner(s) and operator(s) at the facility.	Carolina Power& Light Company d/b/a Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.	Carolina Power& Light Company d/b/a Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.