

Report of Dam Safety Assessment of Coal Combustion Surface Impoundments Westar Energy Tecumseh Energy Center, Clinton, IA

AMEC Project No. 3-2106-0183.0001

Prepared By:

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, KY 40299 Prepared For:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW MC: 5304P Washington, DC 20460

November 2010



I certify that the management units referenced herein:

Westar Energy's Tecumseh Energy Center's Area 1 and Area 2 (ash ponds) were assessed on October 26, 2010.

Signature

Don Dotson, PE Senior Geotechnical Engineer

List of AMEC Participants who have participated in the assessment of the management units and in preparation of the report:

- Chris Eger
   CADD Technician
- Daniel Conn GIS Specialist
- Mary Sawitzki, PE Civil/Environmental Engineer

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	INTR	ODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
	1.1	Introduction	1
	1.2	Project Background	1
		1.2.1 State Issued Permits	2
	1.3	Site Description and Location	
	1.4	Ash Ponds	
		1.4.1 Area 1 Pond	
	4 5	1.4.2 Area 2 Pond	4
	1.5	Previously Identified Safety Issues	
	1.6 1.7	Site Geology Inventory of Provided Materials	
2.0		D ASSESSMENT	5 6
2.0			
	2.1 2.2	Visual Observations Area 1 - Visual Observations	b 7
	2.2	2.2.1 Area 1 - Embankments and Crest	
		2.2.1 Area 1 - Embandments and Crest	
	2.3	Area 2 - Visual Observations	
	2.0	2.3.1 Area 2 - Embankments and Crest	
		2.3.2 Area 2 - Outlet Control Structure	
	2.4	Monitoring Instrumentation	
3.0	DATA	A EVALUATION	
	3.1	Design Assumptions	9
	3.2	Hydrologic and Hydraulic Design	9
		3.2.1 Long Term Hydrologic Design Criteria	
		3.2.1 Documented Hydrologic Design Criteria	
	3.3	Structural Adequacy & Stability	10
	3.3	Structural Adequacy & Stability 3.3.1 Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards	10 10
	3.3	<ul> <li>Structural Adequacy &amp; Stability</li></ul>	10 10 11
		<ul> <li>Structural Adequacy &amp; Stability</li> <li>3.3.1 Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards</li> <li>3.3.2 2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability</li> <li>3.3.3 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability</li> </ul>	10 10 11 13
	3.4	<ul> <li>Structural Adequacy &amp; Stability</li> <li>3.3.1 Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards</li> <li>3.3.2 2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability</li> <li>3.3.3 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability</li> <li>Foundation Conditions</li> </ul>	10 10 11 13 14
		Structural Adequacy & Stability3.3.1Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards3.3.22009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability3.3.32010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm StabilityFoundation ConditionsOperations and Maintenance	10 10 11 13 14 14
/	3.4	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions       Stability         Operations and Maintenance       3.5.1         Safety Assessments       Stability	10 11 13 14 14 14
	3.4	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions       Stability         Operations and Maintenance       Stability         3.5.1       Safety Assessments         3.5.2       Instrumentation	10 11 13 14 14 14 14
4.0	3.4 3.5	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions	10 11 13 14 14 14 14 15 16
4.0	3.4 3.5 COM	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions       Stability         Operations and Maintenance       State y Assessments         3.5.2       Instrumentation         3.5.3       State or Federal Inspections	10 11 13 14 14 14 14 15 16 <b>17</b>
4.0	3.4 3.5 <b>COM</b> I 4.1	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions       Stability         Operations and Maintenance       Stafety Assessments         3.5.1       Safety Assessments         3.5.2       Instrumentation         3.5.3       State or Federal Inspections         MENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS         Acknowledgement of Management Unit Conditions	10 11 13 14 14 14 14 15 16 <b>17</b>
4.0	3.4 3.5 COM	Structural Adequacy & Stability	10 11 13 14 14 14 15 16 <b>17</b> 17
4.0	3.4 3.5 <b>COM</b> I 4.1	Structural Adequacy & Stability	10 11 13 14 14 14 14 15 16 <b>17</b> 17 17
4.0	3.4 3.5 <b>COM</b> I 4.1	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         5.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions	10 11 13 14 14 14 15 16 17 17 17 18 18
4.0	3.4 3.5 <b>COM</b> I 4.1	Structural Adequacy & Stability         3.3.1       Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards         3.3.2       2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         3.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         5.3.3       2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability         Foundation Conditions	10 11 13 14 14 14 15 16 17 17 17 18 18 18

SECTION

Table 1. Site Visit Attendees	1
Table 2. Tecumseh Energy Center Rainfall Data	6
Table 3. MSHA Minimum Long Term Hydrologic Design Criteria	9
Table 4. Minimum Stability Factors of Safety	
Table 5. Laboratory Geotechnical Test Data	11
Table 6. Summary of Engineering Parameters	12
Table 7. Summary of 2009 Stability Analysis	13
Table 8. Summary of 2010 Stability Analysis	14
Table 8. Corrective Actions to Address Recommendations*	15

# FIGURES

Site Location and Vicinity Map	Figure 1
Aerial Site Map	
Critical Infrastructure Map	
1968 Site Contour Map	Figure 4
Area 1 Pond - 1980 Pond Modification Plan	
Area 2 Pond - Location and Grading Plan	Figure 6
Area 2 Pond - Cross Sections	Figure 7
2009 Stability Analysis Berm Height and Boring Location Plan	Figure 8
2009 Stability Analysis Topography and Stability Cross Section Locations	Figure 9
2009 Stability Analysis Cross Sections	Figure 10
2009 Stability Analysis Locations of Observed Deficiencies	Figure 11
Area 1 Pond - 2010 North Embankment Regrade and Piezometers Locations	Figure 12
2010 Stability Analysis Cross Sections	

# APPENDICES

EPA Coal Combustion Dam Inspection Checklists and Coal Combustion	
Waste Impoundment Inspection Forms Data - May 2010	Appendix A
Site Photo Log Map and Site Photos	Appendix B
Inventory of Provided Materials	Appendix C

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

# 1.1 Introduction

AMEC was contracted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contract BPA EP09W001702, to perform assessments of selected coal combustion byproducts surface impoundments. As part of this contract with EPA, AMEC was assigned to perform an assessment of Westar Energy's Tecumseh Energy Center (Tecumseh), which is located in Shawnee County, Kansas, just east of the city of Topeka, as shown on Figure 1, the Site Location and Vicinity Map.

A site visit to Tecumseh Energy Center was made by AMEC on October 26, 2010. The purpose of the visit was to perform visual observations, to inventory coal combustion waste (CCW) surface impoundments, assess the containment dikes, and to collect relevant historical impoundment documentation.

AMEC engineers, Don Dotson, P.E. and Mary Sawitzki, P.E., were accompanied during the site visit by the individuals listed on Table 1.

Company or Organization	Name and Title	
Westar Energy	Paul Wallen, Plant Director	
Westar Energy	Andy Rietcheck, Senior Engineer	
Westar Energy	David Walter, Mgr., Plant Support Engineering	
Westar Energy	Kirk Wiscombe, Supervisor of Fuels	
Westar Energy	Jared Morrison, Mgr., Water Programs	
Westar Energy	Craig Swartzendruber, Mgr., Env. Compliance Systems	

#### Table 1. Site Visit Attendees

# 1.2 Project Background

Coal fired power plants, like Westar Energy's Tecumseh Energy Center, produce CCW as a result of the power production process. At Tecumseh, impoundments (dams) were designed and constructed to provide storage and disposal for the CCW that is produced. Westar Energy refers to the CCW impoundments at the Tecumseh facility as the Area 1 and Area 2 temporary staging ponds. Westar Energy estimates the Area 1 pond was constructed and placed into service in 1968. Later, in 1984, the Area 2 pond, also referred to as the Clear Pond, was placed into service.

The National Inventory of Dams (NID), administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), provides a hazard rating for many dams within the United States. The Area 1 and Area 2 Ponds at Tecumseh Energy Center are not included in the NID.

As part of the observations and evaluations performed at Tecumseh, AMEC completed EPA's Coal Combustion Dam Inspection Checklists and CCW Impoundment Inspection Forms. Inspection forms for each pond are presented in Appendix A. The Impoundment Inspection

Forms include a section that assigns a "Hazard Potential" that is used to indicate what would occur following failure of an impoundment. "Hazard Potential" choices include "Less than Low." "Low," "Significant," and "High." As defined on the Inspection Form, dams assigned a "Significant Hazard Potential" 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." "Low Hazard Potential" classification definition is reserved for dams 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." "Less than Low Hazard Potential" classification is reserved for dams where "failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life and no economic or environmental losses." Based on the site visit evaluation of the impoundments, AMEC engineers assigned a "Significant Hazard" potential to the Area 1 pond and a "Low Hazard" potential to the Area 2 pond. The Area 1 pond was assigned a "Significant Hazard" rating due to the proximity of residences directly across SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from the pond's southern embankment. Additionally, the pond's northern embankment is located directly on Tecumseh Creek, within approximately 700 feet of the Kansas River.

#### 1.2.1 State Issued Permits

The Kansas Division of Environment, Department of Health and Environment issued a Kansas Water Pollution Control Permit and Authorization to Discharge under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to Westar Energy. The current permit identification number is KS0079731. This NPDES Permit authorizes Westar Energy to discharge decant from the Area 2 Ash Pond (Clear Pond) to the Tecumseh Creek. The effective date of the permit is October 1, 2008. The permit will expire on November 30, 2010. On June 2, 2010, Westar Energy submitted a permit renewal request to the Kansas Division of Environment. Renewed permit dates have not yet been provided to Westar Energy.

No other state issued permits were provided. Dam Safety Laws are contained in Kansas Statutes KSA 82a-301 through 305a. Based on the following excerpt from the Dam Safety Law regarding the definition of a "dam",

any artificial barrier including appurtenant works with the ability to impound water, waste water or other liquids that has a height of 25 feet or more; or has a height of six feet or greater and also has the capacity to impound 50 or more acre-feet. The height of a dam or barrier shall be determined as follows: (1) a barrier or dam that extends across the natural bed of a stream or watercourse shall be measured from the downstream toe of the barrier or dam to the top of the barrier or dam; or (2) a barrier or dam that does not extend across a stream or watercourse shall be measured from the lowest elevation of the outside limit of the barrier or dam to the top of the barrier or dam,

it appears that the state of Kansas has not permitted the CCW impoundments at Tecumseh Energy Center as the size of the impoundments do not meet the minimum dam size criteria given in the law.

#### 1.3 Site Description and Location

The Tecumseh Energy Center is located just east of the city of Topeka, Kansas. Areas to the west and south of the facility are primarily mixed use. The Kansas River flows west to east on the northern facility boundary. Areas to the east of the facility are primarily rural. Discharges from the facility flow directly into Tecumseh Creek, which flows into the Kansas River within approximately 700 feet. The Aerial Site Plan, included as Figure 2, provides a view of the two pond areas and their proximity to the creek and river.

Figure 3, the Critical Infrastructure Map, provides an aerial view of the region and indicates the location of the Tecumseh ash ponds in relation to schools, hospitals, and other critical infrastructure that is located within approximately 5 miles down gradient of the impoundments. A table that provides names and coordinate data for the infrastructure is included on the map.

#### 1.4 Ash Ponds

Tecumseh utilizes coal in the production of electricity. In this process, two types of ash are generated: fly ash and bottom ash. Bottom ash, the heavier and coarser of the two, is sluiced into the Area 1 Ash Pond. Some portion of fly ash is sold in dry form, while the remaining fly ash is sluiced to the Area 1 Ash Pond as well. Decant water from the Area 1 Ash Pond is gravity discharged into the Area 2 Ash Pond. Flow from the Area 2 Ash Pond (Clear Pond) is gravity discharged to Tecumseh Creek via the permitted KPDES Outfall 002X1.

The Ash Ponds are used for staging only; there is no permanent disposal of CCW material in the ponds. Bottom ash, fly ash, and other CCW materials are dredged from the Area 1 Ash Pond and disposed of in the on-site dry landfill. According to Westar Energy, the Area 2 Ash Pond (Clear Pond) "is not used for temporary or permanent disposal of CCW." The ash handling summary detailed above was based on review of provided documentation as well as communication with Westar personnel who are knowledgeable concerning the facility's operational processes.

A May 18, 2009 document, written by Westar Energy in response to EPA's Request for Information under Section 104(e) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C 9604(e), provided the following general background for the ash ponds.

- The Area 1 pond is used for staging only. Materials that are discharged into the pond include bottom ash, fly ash, and boiler slag. Additionally, sediment from incoming river water that was collected in the settlement basins and cooling tower is placed into the ponds.
- The Area 2 pond (Clear Pond) was noted to contain only water removed from the Area 1 pond.
- The Area 1 and Area 2 ponds were noted to have been constructed based on engineered designs. However, Westar is not in possession of design drawings that were stamped by a professional engineer.
- It is not known whether the Area 1 and Area 2 ponds were constructed under the supervision of a professional engineer.
- The Area 1 and Area 2 ponds are not presently inspected or monitored by a professional engineer.

Westar Energy's March 18, 2009 response to EPA's Request for Information, as well as recent communications with Westar Energy personnel, provided the following additional information that is specific to each ash pond. Current descriptive information resulting from the site visit, as well as photographic references, are provided in Section 2, which is entitled Field Assessment.

# 1.4.1 Area 1 Pond

The Area 1 Pond is located on the western boundary of the facility. Tecumseh Creek is located to the west and directly to the north of this pond. Figure 4, provided by Westar Energy, illustrates the site contours circa 1968 and the location of Tecumseh Creek with respect to the Area 1 Pond. Westar has described the pond as being "excavated from grade" and finished with "a minimal height berm" constructed around the perimeter. Documentation was not provided that indicated original embankment slope values. The 1968 site contours indicate the crest of the original northern embankment slope may have been close to an elevation of 870 The existing pond crest elevation is 885 feet. Provided documentation indicates the feet. elevation of the downstream toe of the northern embankment slope (Tecumseh Creek) is approximately 846 feet. These values indicate a total berm height of 39 feet, of which approximately 24 feet comprises the original, natural creek embankment, while approximately 15 feet comprises the portion of the embankment that was added following pond excavation activity. Provided topography also indicates the total height of the southern embankment varies from approximately 10 to 20 feet above SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, the public roadway that is located adjacent and parallel to the southern embankment.

In 1980, the Area 1 Pond interior was modified as shown on Figure 5. Portions of the pond were deepened and a separation berm was added to create two, approximately equal regions (northern and southern).

The total surface area of the pond is 2 acres and the storage capacity is 20 acre-feet. The volume of material stored in the unit was not provided. The response noted that "Storage in this area is temporary in nature and varies from no storage to total capacity dependent on current plant operations."

# 1.4.2 Area 2 Pond

The Area 2 Pond is also located on the western boundary of the facility, directly north of the Area 1 Pond and Tecumseh Creek. Westar has also described this pond as being "excavated from grade" and finished with "a minimal height berm" constructed around the perimeter. Figure 6 illustrates the pond's grading and location with respect to Tecumseh Creek and the Area 1 Pond. The pond was commissioned in 1984 to receive decant flow from the Area 1 Pond. Crest elevation is shown as 872 feet and the pond's surface area and storage volume are equal to 1 acre and 12 acre-feet, respectively.

Figure 7 illustrates typical pond cross sections including a section illustrating the decant pipe route from the Area 1 Pond. The typical cross section representing the pond's southern embankment, which is against Tecumseh Creek, indicates that the berm placed above existing grade was constructed with upstream and downstream slopes of 2:1 (H:V) and 3:1 (H:V), respectively. Like the natural northern embankment of the Area 1 Pond, the natural portion of the southern embankment of the Area 2 Pond is steep and its toe is located at Tecumseh Creek. Provided documentation indicates the total height of the southern embankment, from crest to toe, is approximately 26 feet, including approximately 4 to 5 feet added during the construction of the Area 2 Pond.

#### 1.5 Previously Identified Safety Issues

Discussions with plant personnel and review of provided documentation indicate that there are no current or previously identified safety issues from the previous 5 years at the Tecumseh Energy Center facility.

# 1.6 Site Geology

The Tecumseh Energy Center is located south of the Kansas River in Shawnee County. This area is part of the glaciated region of Kansas. The soils consist of glacial drift and loess which consists of varying mixture of silts, clays, sands and gravels. The underlying bedrock in the Glaciated Region is of the Pennsylvanian Age Scranton Formation. The Scranton Formation consists of limestone and shale which predominately dip down to the north and northwest. Glacial erratics are also common in this area commonly consisting of quartzite boulders, known as Sioux quartzite, but also includes sandstone, basalt and granite. The depth to bedrock varies greatly throughout this area from exposed bedrock outcrops to over 100 feet in thickness.

# 1.7 Inventory of Provided Materials

Westar Energy AMEC with several documents pertaining to the design and operation of the Tecumseh Energy Center. These documents were used in the preparation of this report and are listed in Appendix C, Inventory of Provided Materials.

#### 2.0 FIELD ASSESSMENT

#### 2.1 Visual Observations

AMEC performed visual assessments of Tecumseh Ash Pond 1 and Ash Pond 2 on October 26, 2010. Assessment of the ash ponds was completed in general accordance with *FEMA's Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety, Hazard Potential Classification System for Dams, April 2004.* The EPA Coal Combustion Dam Inspection Checklist and Coal Combustion Waste (CCW) Impoundment Inspection Form were completed for each ash pond during the site visit and provided to the EPA via email within five business days following the site visit. Appendix A contains copies of the completed checklist forms. Photo location site maps for each ash pond, as well as descriptive photos, can be found in Appendix B. Rainfall data for the Topeka, Kansas area, located five miles east of Tecumseh Energy Center, was collected for thirty days prior to the date of the site visit. Table 2, below, summarizes the rainfall data for the days and month immediately preceding AMEC's site visit.

Rainfall Prior to Site Visit				
Date	Rainfall (in.)			
October 18, 2010	0.00			
October 19, 2010	0.00			
October 20, 2010	0.00			
October 21, 2010	0.00			
October 22, 2010	0.24			
October 23, 2010	0.34			
October 24, 2010	0.00			
October 25, 2010	0.00			
October 26, 2010	0.24			
Total (9 days prior to visit)	0.82			
October Rainfall	1.30			
Total (30 days prior to visit)	1.30			

# Table 2. Tecumseh Energy Center Rainfall Data

The Area 1 and Area 2 ponds are located west of the main facility buildings with Area 1 located to the south of Area 2. The site layout is illustrated on Figure 2 and Figure B-1 (Photo Log Map in Appendix B). The ponds are separated from one another by Tecumseh Creek which flows between the bases of the steep embankments located on the north and south sides of Area 1 and Area 2, respectively.

# 2.2 Area 1 - Visual Observations

A divider dike separates the Area 1 pond into north and south regions (Photo 1-10). These regions allow for alternating ash sluicing and dredging operations. Sluiced CCW materials are delivered to the northeast side of the Area 1 pond by pipe, where flow either directly enters the northern section of Area 1 or is routed through a small, open concrete channel to the southern portion of Area 1 (Photo 1-5). Photos 1-8 through 1-11 provide a panorama from the west side of the Area1 pond looking north to south.

# 2.2.1 Area 1 - Embankments and Crest

The eastern portions of the Area 1 pond are incised. An embankment exists on the other three sides. A chain link fence sits atop the entire outer crest edge. The south embankment toe of slope is located directly adjacent and parallel to SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (Photo 1-18). A series of widely spaced, modest homes sits across SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street at this location. Although trees and vegetation exist at the southwest slope (Photo 1-17), the south slope had been cleared and contained just a few stumps (Photos 1-19, 1-20 and 1-22). A roadway swale was also visible (Photo 1-21). The west embankment slopes toward the floodplain of Tecumseh Creek. This embankment was not assessed as it was covered with trees and vegetation and was not readily accessible (Photo 1-12). Tecumseh Creek is located at the base of the north embankment. This embankment is very steep, contains some trees and vegetation, and was noted to have been recently groomed (Photos 1-13, 1-14, 1-16, 2-1, and 2-2). The crest of the Area 1 pond was noted to be in good condition, free of erosion or rutting (Photo 1-8 and 1-11).

# 2.2.2 Area 1 - Outlet Control Structures

The pond's outlet control, an open-sided box weir structure, is located on the western pond edge, between the pond's north and south regions (Photo 1-6). Weir plates (Photo 1-7) are located on each side of the structure. Decant from the pond discharges though a pipeline into the Area 2 pond, which is located to the north.

# 2.3 Area 2 - Visual Observations

Decant flow from the Area 1 pond is conveyed to the Area 2 pond through a 16-inch pipe that discharges into the southwest corner of the Area 2 pond (Photo 2-10). The Area 2 pond is not divided, but serves as one settling area for decant from the Area 1 pond. Photos 2-7 through 2-9 provide a panorama, beginning with a western view across Area 2 and ending with an eastern view of the Coal Pile Runoff Pond.

# 2.3.1 Area 2 - Embankments and Crest

The north and east regions of the Area 2 pond are incised. A railroad track and berm is located parallel to and north of the north side of the pond (Photo 2-18). The ground slopes from the southern downstream toe of the railroad berm to the pond's edge. The Coal Pile Runoff Pond, located directly adjacent to and east of the pond, is separated from the Area 2 pond by an approximately 25-foot wide berm.

Based on provided site topography, the western edge of the pond is diked, with what appears to be a maximum height of between two and three feet. Access to this area was not attempted due to the presence of a fence and heavy trees and vegetation along the outer crest edge (Photo 2-17).

The southwest and southern portions of the pond are diked. Both downstream slopes were completely covered with trees and vegetation (Photos 2-1, 2-2, 2-11, 2-15, and 2-16). The southern downstream dike face appeared to be rather steep and without a uniform slope.

A roadway circles the pond atop an approximately 20-foot crest. The crest width appeared mostly uniform with some areas more well gravel covered than others (Photos 2-13 and 2-17).

# 2.3.2 Area 2 - Outlet Control Structure

The Area 2 pond outlet structure, a weir box with a pipe discharge, is located in the southeast corner of the pond (Photo 2-6). The 21-inch diameter corrugated metal pipe discharges into Mill Creek through permitted KPDES Outfall 002X1. This outfall is located southwest of the weir box structure on the downstream embankment face (Photos 2-1 and 2-3). Although riprap is located below the discharge location, trees and vegetation surround the area and the ground surface is not uniformly graded (Photos 2-4 and 2-5). Parallel discharge pipes from the Coal Pile Runoff Pond (permitted KPDES Outfall 004A1) are located directly east of the Area 2 pond permitted KPDES Outfall. Discharge was not visible from the Coal Pile Runoff Pond at the time of the site visit and provided documentation indicates that these pipes are valved and normally closed.

# 2.4 Monitoring Instrumentation

Two piezometers were installed as part of the 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability, as prepared by Golder Associates. These piezometers, known as P-1 and P-2, are located on the crest of the northern embankment of the Area 1 Pond and were installed to "better define piezometric levels at those locations." More specific information regarding the two piezometers is located in later in this assessment report in instrumentation discussion in Section 3.5.2.

#### 3.0 DATA EVALUATION

#### 3.1 Design Assumptions

AMEC has reviewed provided documentation related to design assumptions regarding both hydraulic adequacy and dike stability. However, some design assumptions were not available in the documentation, and have been listed as not provided where necessary.

#### 3.2 Hydrologic and Hydraulic Design

#### 3.2.1 Long Term Hydrologic Design Criteria

The Mine Safety and Health Administration provides minimum hydrologic criteria relevant to CCW impoundments in Impoundment Design Guidelines of the Mining Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) Coal Mine Impoundment Inspection and Plan Review Handbook (Number PH07-01) published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Coal Mine Safety and Health, October 2007.

When detailing impoundment design storm criteria, MSHA states that dams need "to be able to safely accommodate the inflow from a storm event that is appropriate for the size of the impoundment and the hazard potential in the event of failure of the dam." Additionally, MSHA notes that sufficient freeboard, adequate factors of safety for embankment stability, and the prevention of significant erosion to discharge facilities, are all design elements that are required for dam structures under their review. Additional impoundment and design storm criteria are as shown in Table 3, MSHA Minimum Long Term Hydrologic Design Criteria.

Hazard Potential	Impoundment Size		
	< 1000 acre-feet < 40 feet deep	≥ 1000 acre-feet ≥ 40 feet deep	
Low - Impoundments located where failure of the dam would result in no probable loss of human life and low economic and/or environmental losses.	100 - year rainfall**	½ PMF	
Significant/Moderate - Impoundments located where failure of the dam would result in no probably loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, or disruption of lifeline facilities.	½ PMF	PMF	
High - Facilities located where failure of the dam will probably cause loss of human life.	PMF	PMF	

# Table 3. MSHA\* Minimum Long Term Hydrologic Design Criteria

\*Mining Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) Coal Mine Impoundment Inspection and Plan Review Handbook (Number PH07-01) published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Coal Mine Safety and Health, October 2007

\*\*Per MSHA, the 24-hour duration shall be used with the 100-year frequency rainfall.

The definition of design freeboard, according to the MSHA Guidelines, is "the vertical distance between the lowest point on the crest of the embankment and the maximum water surface elevation resulting from the design storm." Additionally, the Handbook states that "Sufficient documentation should be provided in impoundment plans to verify the adequacy of the freeboard." Recommended items to consider when determining freeboard include "potential wave run-up on the upstream slope, ability of the embankment to resist erosion, and potential for embankment foundation settlement." Lastly, the Handbook states, "Without documentation, and absent unusual conditions, a minimum freeboard of 3 feet is generally accepted for impoundments with a fetch of less than 1 mile."

The CCW impoundments at the Tecumseh Energy Center fall within the smallest storm event designation category on Table 3. Using MSHA long term hydrologic criteria, design for the 100-year, 24-hour rainfall event would be recommended.

#### 3.2.1 Documented Hydrologic Design Criteria

A specific hydrologic and hydraulic study was not provided. However, some pertinent information was compiled from other provided documentation and conversations with Westar Energy personnel.

Both the Area 1 and Area 2 Ponds were designed to collect only stormwater tributary to their surface areas. The eastern portion of the Area 1 pond is incised, but a stormwater berm on the northeast side and channelized area on the east and southeast side redirect stormwater runoff away from this pond. A small channelized area exists to the north of the Area 2 pond that redirects stormwater from north of the pond to areas to the west. The Coal Pile Runoff Pond intercepts any other stormwater flowing toward the Area 2 Pond from the east.

Drawings that were provided specify crest and discharge structure weir elevation for both the Area 1 and Area 2 Ponds. The Area 1 discharge weir and crest elevations appear to be 882 feet and 885 feet, respectively, while the Area 2 discharge weir and crest elevations appear to be 868 feet and 872 feet, respectively.

# 3.3 Structural Adequacy & Stability

# 3.3.1 Comparative Stability Factor of Safety Standards

Two well regarded sources for embankment design and evaluation criteria include The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the United States Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA). Minimum recommended factors of safety for different loading conditions can be found in those agency publications, as shown in Table 4 below.

		USACE <sup>2</sup>
Loading Condition	MSHA	USACE
Rapid Drawdown	1.3	1.1 <sup>3</sup> - 1.3 <sup>4</sup>
Long-Term Steady Seepage	1.5	1.5
Earthquake Loading	1.2	5

# Table 4. Minimum Stability Factors of Safety

<sup>1</sup> Coal Mine Impoundment Inspection and Plan Review Handbook, 2007, US Mine Safety and Health Administration

<sup>2</sup> Slope Stability Publication, EM1110-2-1902, 2003, US Army Corps of Engineers, Table 3-1: New Earth and Rock-Fill Dams
 <sup>3</sup> Applies to drawdown from maximum surcharge pool

<sup>4</sup> Applies to drawdown from maximum storage pool

<sup>5</sup> Referred to USACE Engineer Circular "Dynamic Analysis of Embankment Dams" document that is still in preparation

To consider the structural adequacy and stability of the ash ponds at Tecumseh Energy Center, AMEC reviewed stability analysis material provided by Westar Energy with respect to the load cases shown in Table 4. Factors of safety documented in the provided material were compared with those factors outlined in the table to help determine whether the impoundments meet the requirements for acceptable stability.

# 3.3.2 2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability

Golder Associates completed the report entitled *Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability*, Westar Energy - Tecumseh Energy Center, dated December 2009 (2009 Report). Golder reported on site observations and stability evaluations of the CCW storage facilities at Tecumseh in response to the EPA's request for information under Section 104(e) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Golder Associates advanced four soil borings, TEC-1, TEC-3, TEC-4, and TEC-5, in October 2009. The borings were drilled between the center and the downstream edge of the berm crests and located in areas with downstream embankment heights of 12 feet or more. Figure 8, from Golder's 2009 Report, illustrates the boring locations as well as the berm areas with heights noted to be greater than 12 feet. A truck mounted CME drill rig and 6-inch diameter hollow stem continuous flight augers were used to collect relatively undisturbed soil samples. "Borehole depths ranged from 15 to 25 feet" and Golder reported that "berm stratigraphy was fairly consistent between boreholes and generally consisted of 1 foot of gravel road surface underlain by low-plasticity clay (CL) and high-plasticity clay (CH) layers." Groundwater, Golder noted, was "observed only in TEC-1, which was drilled on the south side of Area 2, at an elevation of 853 feet above mean sea level." The Area 1 Pond and Area 2 Pond had respective, reported crest elevations of 885 feet and 870 feet above mean sea level.

Two cross sections, Section 1 and Section 2, were located to represent critical slope conditions with respect to stability. Figure 9 illustrates the cross section locations as chosen by Golder for the 2009 stability analyses as well as site topographic information provided by Westar Energy. Golder "conservatively assumed that the staging areas were filled with CCP's to an elevation two feet below the berm crests and that ponded water reached the same elevation as the berm crests." Further, based on their visual observation of the drained and cleaned north pool of the Area 1 pond, Golder assumed the depth of the CCP storage facility to be 20 feet. A 0.5 to 1.0 (H:V) slope ratio was chosen for the upstream embankment slopes, apparently based on the same visual assessment by Golder.

Table 5 summarizes the engineering parameters presented by Golder, based on the relatively undisturbed soil samples.

Borehole	Sample	Depth	USCS	Dry Unit Weight (pcf)	Moisture Content (%)	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index	Friction Angle (deg)	Cohesion (psf)
TEC-1	1	3-5'		94	28					
TEC-1	2	13-15'	CL	98	26	44	19	25	31	110
TEC-1	3	23-25'			24					
TEC-3	2	13-15'	СН	100	24	50	17	33		
TEC-4	2	13-15'	CL	102	23	42	18	24	29	170
TEC-5	1	3-5'	CL	104	22	48	18	30		

# Table 5. Laboratory Geotechnical Test Data

The report notes that for "purposes of the stability analyses, Golder represented distinct soil layers and assigned engineering parameters based on proximity to sampling locations, field soil classification and laboratory test data." Figure 10 illustrates the 2009 stability analyses Section 1 (Area 1 Pond) and Section 2 (Area 2 Pond), including assigned engineering parameters. Unit weights were assigned to each soil layer based on "density testing of undisturbed soil samples collected at TEC." The boring identification appears to have been inadvertently left out of the document. Further, the report noted with regard to parameters,

For CL materials, Golder assigned effective stress strength parameters based on the results of the consolidated-undrained triaxial testing of undisturbed samples collected at TEC. Since consolidated-undrained triaxial testing was not performed on samples of CH materials collected at TEC, Golder assigned effective stress strength parameters to CH layers based on the results of consolidated-undrained triaxial testing of undisturbed samples of similar CH material collected at Lawrence Energy Center on October 26, 2009. Golder assigned a unit weight to CCPs based on previous experience and assumed that CCPs within the staging areas contribute no strength.

Table 6 provides a summary of the assigned engineering parameters.

Material	Unit Weight (pcf)	Strength Parameters		
Material	Onit Weight (pci)	Friction Angle (deg)	Cohesion (psf)	
TEC-1 Sample 2 (PI=25, Section 2)	123	31	110	
TEC-4 Sample 2 (PI=24, Section 1)	126	29	170	
TEC-3 Sample 2 (PI=33)/TEC-2 Sample 1 (PI=39)	124	26	260	
Coal Combustion Products (CCPs)	85	No Strength		

#### **Table 6. Summary of Engineering Parameters**

Groundwater was reportedly not observed in any boreholes near Section 1; therefore, Golder assumed a groundwater surface located just below the bottom of borehole TEC-3, which is located closest to Section 1. Therefore, the groundwater elevation at Section 1 was identified as "860 feet above mean sea level, 7 feet higher that the groundwater at TEC-1." The phreatic surface was assumed to be a straight line between the "upstream edge of the berm crest and the assumed static groundwater level" at the borehole. Groundwater was located at 853 feet above mean sea level at boring TEC-1. Therefore, since TEC-1 is near Section 2, "the phreatic surface in the center of the berm was set to that elevation." The phreatic surface alignment in Section 2 was located as described for Section 1.

A two-dimensional computer program developed by Rocscience Inc. (2009), entitled SLIDE, as used to analyze embankment stability. Golder noted that "Factors of safety for static conditions were computed for circular failure surfaces using Spencer's method for force and moment equilibrium." A seismic coefficient of 0.05, based on a two percent chance of reoccurrence in a 50 year period, and Spencer's method, as described above, were used to compute factors of safety for seismic loading conditions. Table 7 illustrates the computed factors of safety.

Cross Section and Analysis Condition	Computed Factor of Safety	Minimum Factor of Safety*
Section 1 - Static	1.0	1.5
Section 1 - Seismic	0.9	1.1
Section 2 - Static	1.6	1.5
Section 2 - Seismic	1.4	1.1

#### Table 7. Summary of 2009 Stability Analysis

\*Golder noted minimum factor of safety values.

Golder noted that, "Based on the factors of safety computed using SLIDE, some portions of the CCP storage facilities at TEC [1] may be only stable under static conditions and may become unstable during a seismic event or if loaded beyond the assumed conditions." Computed static and seismic factors of safety for Section1 do not meet minimum acceptable factor of safety criteria. The stability of Section 2 was found to be acceptable, with factors of safety exceeding accepted minimums.

Following the initial stability calculations, Golder performed additional analysis and determined that acceptable factors of safety would be obtained for Section 1 if the existing slope was decreased (flattened), specifically to 1.7:1 (H:V). Calculated factor of safety values for the flattened slope section were determined to be 1.5 and 1.3 for static and seismic conditions, respectively. Figure 11 illustrates the boundaries of the over steep slope area of the Area 1 Pond's north embankment that would require repair.

#### 3.3.3 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability

The 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability report was written by Golder to provide analyses results for the proposed slope improvements and regrade of the Area 1 Pond's north embankment slope.

Although several borings had been advanced for the 2009 evaluation of berm stability, two additional borings, P-1 and P-2, were advanced in the northern crest of the Area 1 Pond for the 2010 study, as shown on Figure 12. Piezometers were installed in these borings at locations designed by Golder and Westar, "to better define piezometric levels" in the area. Figure 12 illustrates the piezometer locations and information specific to these piezometers is provided in Section 3.5.2.

Golder addressed phreatic surfaces for Section 1 by determining the groundwater elevation in the piezometers, P-1 and P-2, five months following installation. The observed elevation was noted as 859 feet above mean sea level. It was noted in the report that Golder assumed the phreatic surface would consist of two surfaces;

- (1) A straight line between the upstream edge of the berm crest and the observed groundwater level in P-2 at a horizontal distance of 16 feet from the upstream edge of the berm crest, and
- (2) A straight line from the observed groundwater level in P-2 at a horizontal distance of 16 feet from the upstream edge of the berm crest to the observed flow depth in Tecumseh Creek at the interface of the riprap (used in the slope repair) and the native soil.

Golder noted that the groundwater level in a test hole, which was excavated near Section 1 in September 2010, was at elevation 851 feet above mean sea level. This level was noted as "in agreement with the assumed phreatic surface." The phreatic surface for Section 2 was determined following a similar approach.

The same stability cross section locations were used for the 2010 evaluation; however, the downstream slope of Section 1 was flattened to 1.7: (H:V) as indicated by the additional analysis that followed the 2009 evaluation. Figure 12 illustrates the uniformly regraded north embankment slope of the Area 1 Pond. Figure 13 illustrates the 2010 stability analyses Section 1 (Area 1 Pond) and Section 2 (Area 2 Pond), including assigned engineering parameters. The engineering parameters for the 2010 study included an entry for riprap material, with parameter values as shown on Figure 13, due to the fact that the proposed regrade included riprap placement at the base of the slope. Table 8 illustrates the computed factors of safety resulting from the flattened slope and riprap addition.

Cross Section and Analysis Condition	Computed Factor of Safety	Minimum Factor of Safety*
Section 1 - Static	1.5	1.5
Section 1 - Seismic	1.3	1.1
Section 2 - Static**	1.5	1.5
Section 2 - Seismic**	1.4	1.1

# Table 8. Summary of 2010 Stability Analysis

\*Golder noted minimum factor of safety values.

\*\*2009 analysis result.

Golder noted that the results indicate that the Area 1 and Area 2 Ponds should "remain stable under maximum anticipated loading conditions."

# 3.4 Foundation Conditions

As stated by Westar Energy, both ponds were created through excavation from existing grade. Soil information for areas below the added berm height was determined through review of the boring logs. The logs indicate the original foundation in the Area 1 Pond to be stiff, brown to reddish-brown, SILTY CLAY, little to some sand, (CL to CH). The Area 2 Pond original foundation material was described as stiff, dark brown, SILTY CLAY, little sand (CL) with deeper portions as stiff, dark brown, CLAY, trace sand, (CH).

# 3.5 Operations and Maintenance

#### 3.5.1 Safety Assessments

#### 2009 Visual Observation

Golder performed a visual observation of the Tecumseh Energy Center on October 27, 2009 in conjunction with the 2009 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability report they were preparing. Inflow and outflow structures, upstream berm slopes, berm crests, downstream berm slopes, and berm toes were assessed. Subsequent site visits occurred on December 11 and December 16, 2009. Various recommendations given in that report lead Westar Energy to contract with Golder to complete the September 2010 *TCOM North Ash Pond Berm Redesign* project which addressed the slope stability concerns. Additional site visits were completed by Golder in February, March, August, and October, 2010. Golder provided a summary table regarding

several recommended action items in the 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability report. Table 8, from the 2010 report, summarizes the recommended action items, corrective action, and the status of each as of October 14, 2010.

Recommendation	Corrective Action(s)	Status
Implement measures to contain CCPs in the event of a leak or rupture of above-ground inflow piping	Relocate inflow piping to sturdier pipe rack	In progress
	Construct containment berm along downstream berm crest	In progress
Reshape slope to 1.7 (horizontal) to 1 (vertical) or flatter**	Reshape slope using an engineered design	Complete
Implement erosion control techniques on reshaped slope**	Install turf reinforcement mat in flattened areas	Complete
	Plant native vegetation in flattened areas	Complete
Install armoring at the berm toe**	Install riprap at the berm toe	Complete
Install armoring at the outfall location***	Install riprap at the outfall location	Complete

Table 8. Corrective Actions to Address Re	Recommendations*
---	------------------

\*from 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability report, by Golder Inc.

\*\*Refers to northern downstream embankment of Area 1.

\*\*\*Refers to outfall located on southern embankment of Area 2.

#### 2010 Technical Memo Regarding Vegetation

Golder Associates submitted a Technical Memorandum (TM) to Westar Energy on October 21, 2010 regarding Vegetation on Ash Pond Berm Slopes at Westar Energy's Lawrence and Tecumseh Energy Centers. In that TM, Golder's opinion was "that the overall effect of the vegetation at [Lawrence and Tecumseh Energy Centers] is beneficial and that removal of shrubs and trees is not likely to result in a slope stability improvement." This recommendation was primarily based on the work of Donald Gray and Robin Sotir and other authors. We note, however, that the primary emphasis of these references is regarding slope stability erosion control and not primarily the structural integrity of impoundments. Golder also stated that they were "not aware of any instances where the structural instability of an earthen structure was demonstrated to have been caused primarily by the presence of vegetation." FEMA 534, "Technical Manual for Dam Owners: Impacts of Plants on Earthen Dams" provides instances of dam breaching linked directed to woody vegetation. We understand that removal of vegetation may be an issue with various regulatory bodies and other stakeholders, but AMEC ultimately recommends a more aggressive vegetation management program.

# 3.5.2 Instrumentation

Two piezometers P-1 AND P-2, were installed as part of the 2010 Evaluation of Ash Pond Berm Stability study and are located as illustrated on Figure 12. The borehole depth for the piezometers was noted to be 40 feet. Additionally, polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe was used, with the lowest 10 feet being slotted PVC, and a 10 foot high bentonite seal was placed in the annular space above the granular material filter pack. The piezometers have lockable well caps and have been registered with the Kansas Department of Health and Environment.

# 3.5.3 State or Federal Inspections

There have been no state or federal inspections at the Tecumseh Energy Center. No future inspections are anticipated.

#### 4.0 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Condition assessment definitions, as accepted by the National Dam Safety Review Board, are as follows:

#### **SATISFACTORY**

No existing or potential dam safety deficiencies are recognized. Acceptable performance is expected under all loading conditions (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable regulatory criteria or tolerable risk guidelines.

# <u>FAIR</u>

No existing dam safety deficiencies are recognized for normal loading conditions. Rare or extreme hydrologic and/or seismic events may result in a dam safety deficiency. Risk may be in the range to take further action.

# POOR

A dam safety deficiency is recognized for loading conditions which may realistically occur. Remedial action is necessary. POOR may also be used when uncertainties exist as to critical analysis parameters which identify a potential dam safety deficiency. Further investigations and studies are necessary.

#### **UNSATISFACTORY**

A dam safety deficiency is recognized that requires immediate or emergency remedial action for problem resolution.

# NOT RATED

The dam has not been inspected, is not under state jurisdiction, or has been inspected but, for whatever reason, has not been rated.

#### 4.1 Acknowledgement of Management Unit Conditions

I certify that the management units referenced hereinafter were personally assessed by me and was found to be in the following condition:

#### <u>Area 1 Pond: Poor</u>

#### Area 2 Pond: Poor

#### 4.2 Recommendations

The management units above were rated poor because of lack of documentation. Specifically, hydrologic and hydraulic documentation was not provided for either pond.

#### 4.2.1 Hydrologic and Hydraulic

AMEC recommends that an appropriate design storm rainfall and freeboard depth in accordance with MSHA guidelines be applied to watershed that is tributary to the Area 1 and Area 2 ponds to assess whether the dam and decant system can safely store, control, and discharge the design flow. Based on the size and rating for the ponds, the MSHA recommended design storm would be the 100-year, 24-hour event. Hydraulic calculations should also be completed to determine the rate at which the discharge system could pass the design storm, if necessary, or draw down elevated water surfaces following such an event. The analysis should consider all critical stages over the life of the pond including full pond conditions.

# 4.2.2 Geotechnical and Stability Recommendations

Based on the stability analyses provided to AMEC, the Area 1 and Area 2 ponds meet minimum factors of safety.

#### 4.2.3 Monitoring and Instrumentation Recommendations

Continue to monitor and record water surface elevations in the piezometers P-1 and P-2 that were installed in the northern crest of the Area 1 Pond.

#### 4.2.4 Inspection Recommendations

Annual visual inspections of each management unit should be performed by a Professional Engineer. These inspections should be documented reports and should be maintained by the facility.

Additionally, weekly visual inspections should be performed by facility O&M personnel and should be supported by an inspection checklist that would serve as documentation of these inspections.

AMEC recommends that vegetation on the impoundments be aggressively managed based on guidance in (a) Corps of Engineers EM 1110-2-301, *Guidelines for Landscape Planting and Vegetation Management at Floodwalls, Levees, and Embankment Dams* and (b) FEMA 534, *Technical Manual for Dam Owners: Impacts of Plants on Earthen Dams*. Additionally, any animal impact should be mitigated based on guidance in FEMA 473, *Technical Manual for Dam Owners: Impacts of Plants*.

#### 5.0 CLOSING

This report is prepared for the exclusive use of the Environmental Protection Agency for the site and criteria stipulated herein. This report does not address regulatory issues associated with storm water runoff, the identification and modification of regulated wetlands, or ground water recharge areas. Further, this report does not include review or analysis of environmental or regional geo-hydrologic aspects of the site, except as noted herein. Questions or interpretation regarding any portion of the report should be addressed directly by the geotechnical engineer.

Any use, reliance on, or decisions to be made based on this report by a third party are the responsibility of such third parties. AMEC accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

The conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on visual observations, our partial knowledge of the history of the Tecumseh Energy Center impoundments, and information provided to us by others. This report has been prepared in accordance with normally accepted geotechnical engineering practices. No other warranty is expressed or implied.

EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

# **US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT**

FIGURES









S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig6-area2loc.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:37am - chris.eger

at an and the second	
FIVE EXISTING YARD INLETS TO BE PLUG	5ED
	DATE:
T OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	11/22/10 PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS	REV. NO.:
OCATION AND GRADING PLAN	FIGURE No.



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig7-arrea2crosssection.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 29, 2010 9:48am - chris.eger

TYPICAL	
KALCITED METAL PIVE - 23X3X2 CHAIN LINK FENCE	KITTING GRADE
880	
POND	
T OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DATE: 11/22/10 PROJECT NO: 3-2108-0183.0001
ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS OND - CROSS SECTIONS	REV. NO.: FIGURE No. 7



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig8bermandboring.dwg - Layout2 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:40am - chris.eger



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig4-1968contour.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:37am - chris.eger

OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL       DATE: 11/22/10         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS       PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001         ESTAR ENERGY       REV. NO.:         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS       FIGURE No.	900	
Image: Content of the second secon		
OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS         ESTAR ENERGY         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS         FIGURE NO.         FIGURE NO.         FIGURE NO.		
OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS         ESTAR ENERGY         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS         FIGURE NO.         FIGURE NO.         FIGURE NO.		
Image: Star Energy RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS       REV. NO:         FIGURE NAD       REV. NO:         FIGURE NAD       FIGURE NAD		$\Lambda = \Lambda = \Lambda + \Lambda + \Pi + \Pi + \Pi$
Image: Star Energy Rgy Center, Tecumseh, KS       Rev. No:         Figure No.       Figure No.		
OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS         ESTAR ENERGY         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS         ITE CONTOURD MAD		c
OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS         ESTAR ENERGY         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS         ITE CONTOURD MAD	920	
OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL       DATE: 11/22/10         SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS       PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001         ESTAR ENERGY       REV. NO:         RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS       FIGURE No.		
Image: Constraint of the second state of the seco		
ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS ITE CONTOUR MAR	F OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	11/22/10 PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
	ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS SITE CONTOUR MAP	



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh \Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig5-area1-1980.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:02am - chris.eger



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig6-area2loc.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:37am - chris.eger

at an and the second	
FIVE EXISTING YARD INLETS TO BE PLUG	5ED
	DATE:
T OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	11/22/10 PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS	REV. NO.:
OCATION AND GRADING PLAN	FIGURE No.



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig7-arrea2crosssection.dwg - Layout1 - Nov. 29, 2010 9:48am - chris.eger

TYPICAL	
KALCITED METAL PIVE - 23X3X2 CHAIN LINK FENCE	KITTING GRADE
880	
POND	
T OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DATE: 11/22/10 PROJECT NO: 3-2108-0183.0001
ESTAR ENERGY RGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS OND - CROSS SECTIONS	REV. NO.: FIGURE No. 7



S:\Geosciences\Proposals\EPA Coal Impoundment Inspection\September Round 8\Tecumseh\Tecumseh Photos and CAD files\figures\tecumsehfig8bermandboring.dwg - Layout2 - Nov. 22, 2010 10:40am - chris.eger










# **US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT**

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Waste Impoundment Inspection Forms



#### Site Name: Tecumseh Energy Center

#### Unit Name: Area 1

### Date: October 26, 2010 Operator's Name: Westar Energy, Inc.

Unit I.D.:

# Hazard Potential Classification: High Significant Low

### Inspector's Name: Don Dotson/AMEC and Mary Sawitzki/AMEC

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.

	Yes	No		Yes	No
1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?	See	See note 18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?		See	e note
2. Pool elevation (operator records)? See note	882.	25 ft.	19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?	See r	
3. Decant inlet elevation (operator records)?	882	.0 ft.	20. Decant Pipes:		
4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?	N	/A	Is water entering inlet, but not exiting outlet?		Х
5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?	88	35 ft.	Is water exiting outlet, but not entering inlet?		Х
6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?	N/A		Is water exiting outlet flowing clear?	Х	
7. Is the embankment currently under construction?		Х	21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):		
8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation, stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?	See	note	From underdrain?	See Note	
9. Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)	Х		At isolated points on embankment slopes?		e Note
10. Cracks or scarps on crest?		Х	X At natural hillside in the embankment area?		e Note
11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?		Х	X Over widespread areas?		e Note
12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?	N/A		From downstream foundation area?		e Note
13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?		Х	"Boils" beneath stream or ponded water?		e Note
14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?		Х	Around the outside of the decant pipe?	See Note	
15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?	N/A		22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?	le? See Not	
16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?		Х	23. Water against downstream toe?	against downstream toe? See	
17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?	See	note	24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?	2 X	

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

- 1. Westar does not formally inspect ponds. Westar has plans to institute formal inspection program.
- 2. High weir flow 6" (882.5 ft.) Low weir flow 3" (882.25 ft.)

5. Topography and recent Golder Stability Report show minimum crest elevation between 885 ft. and 885.5 ft.

- 6. None but temporarily installed for Golder's Stability Analysis/Geotechnical Investigation
- 7. Just finished bank repair (north) of Ash Pond 1 (Main) 2009 Report/DWGs and 2010 Follow up
- 8. Majority of pond is incised, no information provided regarding preparation of any constructed embankment section.
- 9. Trees on embankment 18" 24" diameter

17. - 19. & 21 - 23. Difficult to determine due to heavy vegetation on embankment and toe of slope.



## Coal Combustion Waste (CCW) Impoundment Inspection

Impoundment NPDES Permit # KS0079731	INSPECTOR Don Dotson/Mary Sawitzki
Date October 26, 2010	(AMEC)

Impoundment Name	Area 1 Pond
Impoundment Company	Westar Energy
EPA Region	7
State Agency (Field Offic	e) Address

Name of Impoundment <u>Area 1 Pond</u> (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:** <u>Receives sluiced coal combustion waste; primarily bottom ash;</u> <u>minor fly ash amounts</u>

Nearest Downstr	eam Town : Name	e <u>Lecompton, K</u>	S	
Distance from th	e impoundment app	prox. 7 miles		
Impoundment				
Location:	Longitude <u>-95</u>	Degrees34		Seconds
	Latitude 39	Degrees3	<u>Minutes 7.9</u>	Seconds
	State KS	County Shaw	nee	

Does a state agency regulate this impoundment? YES \_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_X

If S	So V	Which	State	Agency?_
				0 1 -

EPA Form XXXX-XXX, Jan 09

**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.

X 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.

# DESCRIBE REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

Proximity to Kansas River; also rural homes adjacent to south embankment just outside facility property boundary

# **CONFIGURATION:**



# **<u>TYPE OF OUTLET</u>** (Mark all that apply)



<u>No Outlet</u>

# X Other Type of Outlet (specify) Box w/ weir inlet (L= 2 ft.) discharge through 16-inch outlet pipe

The Impoundment was Designed By <u>Kansas Power and Light Company (now Westar</u> Energy)

Has there ever been a failure at this site? YES	NO	X	
f So When?			
f So Please Describe :			

Has there ever been significant seepages at this site?	YES	NO	X
If So When?			
F So Please Describe:			

Has there ever been any measures under						
Phreatic water table levels based on past seepages or breachesat this site?N/AYESNO						
at this site? IN/A	YESNO					
If so, which method (e.g., piezometers,	gw pumping,)?					
If so Please Describe :						



Vaa

Low

NIG

#### Site Name: Tecumseh Energy Center

#### Unit Name: Area 2

#### Date: October 26, 2010 Operator's Name: Westar Energy, Inc.

Unit I.D.:

#### Hazard Potential Classification: High Significant

### Inspector's Name: Don Dotson/AMEC and Mary Sawitzki/AMEC

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. NIa

Vaa

	Yes	No		Yes	No	
1. Frequency of Company's Dam Inspections?	See	note	18. Sloughing or bulging on slopes?	See note		
2. Pool elevation (operator records)?	868.	25 ft	19. Major erosion or slope deterioration?	See note		
3. Decant inlet elevation (operator records)?	86	8 ft	20. Decant Pipes:			
4. Open channel spillway elevation (operator records)?	N	/A	Is water entering inlet, but not exiting outlet?		Х	
5. Lowest dam crest elevation (operator records)?	871	l ft	Is water exiting outlet, but not entering inlet?		Х	
6. If instrumentation is present, are readings recorded (operator records)?	N/A		Is water exiting outlet flowing clear?	X		
7. Is the embankment currently under construction?		Х	21. Seepage (specify location, if seepage carries fines, and approximate seepage rate below):			
8. Foundation preparation (remove vegetation,stumps, topsoil in area where embankment fill will be placed)?	See	note	From underdrain?	See Note		
<ol> <li>Trees growing on embankment? (If so, indicate largest diameter below)</li> </ol>	Х		At isolated points on embankment slopes?		e Note	
10. Cracks or scarps on crest?		Х	At natural hillside in the embankment area?		e Note	
11. Is there significant settlement along the crest?		Х	X Over widespread areas?		e Note	
12. Are decant trashracks clear and in place?	N/A		From downstream foundation area?		See Note	
13. Depressions or sinkholes in tailings surface or whirlpool in the pool area?		Х	X "Boils" beneath stream or ponded water?		e Note	
14. Clogged spillways, groin or diversion ditches?		Х	Around the outside of the decant pipe?	See Note		
15. Are spillway or ditch linings deteriorated?	N/A		22. Surface movements in valley bottom or on hillside?	ttom or on hillside? See N		
16. Are outlets of decant or underdrains blocked?	N	lo	23. Water against downstream toe?	See	e Note	
17. Cracks or scarps on slopes?	See	note	24. Were Photos taken during the dam inspection?	1? X		

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

Westar does not formally inspect ponds. Westar has plans to institute formal inspection program. 1.

#### Majority of pond is incised, no information provided regarding preparation of any constructed embankment section 8.

9. Trees present 18" - 24" diameter

17-19 & 21-23 Difficult to determine due to heavy vegetation on embankment and toe of slope.



# Coal Combustion Waste (CCW) Impoundment Inspection

Impoundment NPDES Permit # <u>KS0079731</u>	INSPECTOR Don Dotson/Mary Sawitzki
Date October 26, 2010	
Impoundment Name <u>Area 2</u>	
Impoundment Company <u>Westar Energy</u>	
EPA Region7	
State Agency (Field Office) Address	
Kansas Dept. of Health and Environmental	USEPA Region 7
1000 SW Jackson	901 N. 5 <sup>th</sup>
Topeka, KS 66612	Kansas City, KS 66101
Name of Impoundment Area 2 Pond	
(Report each impoundment on a separate form under	r the same Impoundment NPDES
Permit number)	t the same impoundment in DES
New X Update	
	Yes No
Is impoundment currently under construction?	X
Is water or ccw currently being pumped into	<u>    X                                </u>
the impoundment?	<u>X</u>
IMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION. Designed for the	
<b>IMPOUNDMENT FUNCTION:</b> <u>Receives decant from</u>	
ID 002X1	
Nearest Downstream Town : Name Lecompton, k	Z S
Distance from the impoundment <u>approx. 7 miles</u>	
Impoundment	
Location: Longitude <u>-95</u> Degrees <u>34</u>	Minutes 22.2 Seconds
ë <u> </u>	MinutesSeconds
State <u>KS</u> County <u>Shav</u>	
State KS County Shav	
Does a state agency regulate this impoundment? YE	ESNOX
If So Which State Agency? Only for NPDES standp	oint

EPA Form XXXX-XXX, Jan 09

**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.

X 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.

# DESCRIBE REASONING FOR HAZARD RATING CHOSEN:

Area 1 Pond contains decant from Area 1 Pond; does not receive directly discharged CCW. Pond does not present hazard to rural homes that are located adjacent to Area 1 Pond.

# **CONFIGURATION:**



# **<u>TYPE OF OUTLET</u>** (Mark all that apply)



<u>No Outlet</u>

# X Other Type of Outlet (specify) Box w/ weir inlet discharge through 21-inch outlet pipe

The Impoundment was Designed By Kansas Power and Light Company (now Westar Energy)

Has there ever been a failure at this site? YES	NO	X	
f So When?			
f So Please Describe :			

Has there ever been significant seepages at this site?	YES	NO	X
If So When?			
F 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? N/A					
at this site? IN/A	YESNO				
If so, which method (e.g., piezometers,	gw pumping,)?				
If so Please Describe :					

APPENDIX B Site Photo Log Map and Site Photos





1-1 CENTRAL EAST SIDE LOOKING SOUTH



1-2 CENTRAL EAST SIDE LOOKING SOUTHWEST

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15,	/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.00	JO1
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDOX:	3-2



1-3 CENTRAL EAST SIDE LOOKING WEST ALONG DIVIDING DIKE



1-4 CENTRAL EAST SIDE LOOKING NORTHWEST

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		ENVIRO	D STATES DNMENTAL ION AGENC	(
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11	/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-018	3.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-3



1-5

CENTRAL EAST SIDE LOOKING NORTH (UPSTREAM) AT SLUICED ASH INFLUENT CHANNEL



1-6 LOOKING NORTH AT AREA 1 DISCHARGE STRUCTURE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec®		ENVIRO	D STATES DNMENTAL TON AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-4



1-7 OUTELT STRUCTURE WEIR PLATE



1-8 CENTRAL WEST SIDE LOOKING NORTH

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louiaville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec		ENVIRG	D STATES DNMENTAL TON AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-5



1-9 CENTRAL WEST SIDE LOOKING NORTHEAST



1-10 CENTRAL WEST SIDE LOOKING EAST ALONG DIVIDING DIKE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec®		ENVIRG	D STATES DNMENTAL ION AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NÖ.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-6



1-11 CENTRAL WEST SIDE LOOKING SOUTH



1-12 CENTRAL WEST SIDE LOOKING WEST AT TREES ON UPSTREAM SLOPE OUTSIDE FENCE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec®		ENVIRO	D STATES DNMENTAL TON AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
		CHKD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-7



1-13

LOOKING NORTHEAST FROM NORTH CREST AT TECUMSEH CREEK AND AREA OF TREE/VEGETATION REMOVAL AND REPAIR ON DOWNSTREAM SLOPE



1-14 LOOKING SOUTH AT AREA 1 NORTH EMBANKMENT DOWNSTREAM REPAIR

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec		ENVIRO PROTECT	D STATES DNMENTAL ION AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/*
	•	CHKD BY: MOS	REV. NÖ.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.000
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-







1-16 LOOKING SOUTHWEST AT AREA 1 NORTH EMBANKMENT DOWNSTREAM SLOPE REPAIR AREA

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		ENVIRG	D STATES DNMENTAL	r
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11	1/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-018	3.0001
	TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDX:	B-9



1-17 LOOKING NORTH AT TREES/VEGETATION ON DOWNSTREAM TOE OF SOUTHWEST EMBANKMENT



1-18 LOOKING EAST ALONG SE 2ND STREET AND DOWNSTREAM TOE OF SOUTHERN EMBANKMENT SLOPE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®			D STATES DNMENTA ION AGEN	L
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUST	ION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS	DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE:	11/15/10
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-	0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-10





1-21 ROADWAY SWALE AT DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT TOE OF SLOPE



2-22 STUMP ON DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT FACE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700		ENVIRG	D STATES ONMENTAL TION AGENCY
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFAC	E IMPOUNDMENTS DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
	CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMS AREA 1 PHOLO LOGS	EH, KS PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-12



2-1

LOOKING NORTH FROM NORTH CREST AT TECUMSEH CREEK AND AREA 2 SOUTHEMBANKMENT AND KPDES DISCHARGE OUTFALLS



LOOKING NORTH FROM NORTH CREST AT AREA 2 SOUTH EMBANKMENT AND EXISTING VEGETATION AND TREE COVER

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE:	11/15/10
WESTAR ENERGY		CHKD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-(	0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-13



LOOKING NORTH FROM AREA 1 NORTH CREST TO AREA 2 KPDES (DISCHARGING ON LEFT) AND COAL PILE RUNOFF POND (RIGHT) OUTFALLS



2-4 AREA 2 KPDES OUTFALL FROM ABOVE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		Y
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 1	1/15/10
		CHKTO BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-018	33.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-14



2-5 VEGETATION AND TREES ADJACENT TO KPDES OUTFALL



2-6 LOOKING WEST ALONG SOUTHERN EMBANKMENT CREST AT AREA 2 DECANT STRUCTURE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
		CHKTD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-15



2-7 LOOKING NORTHWEST ACROSS POND



2-8 LOOKING NORTH AT DIVIDING DIKE BETWEEN AREA 2 AND COAL PILE RUNOFF POND

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENC	
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/1
		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.000
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-1



2-9

LOOKING NORTHEAST ALONG SOUTHERN EMBANKMENT OF COAL PILE RUNOFF POND-CONTINUATION OF AREA 2 SOUTHERN DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT



2-10 INFLUENT PIPE DISCHARGING DECANT FROM AREA 1 OUTFALL STRUCTURE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		,
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/	/15/10
TITLE WESTAR ENERGY		CHKTD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183	.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-17







2-12

LOOKING NORTH ACROSS WESTERN AREA OF POND-CONCRETE CINDER PIT EMERGENCY OVERFLOW STRUCTURE VISIBLE AT BACK RIGHT

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE:	11/15/10
WESTAR ENERGY		CHKTD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0	183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-18



LOOKING EAST ACROSS POND AND SOUTHERN EMBANKMENT CREST-TREES AND VEGETATION VISIBLE ON DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT



2-14 LOOKING SOUTHEAST TOWARD AREA 1 AT AREA 1 DECANT PIPE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENC	
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
WESTAR ENERGY		CHKTD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-19







2-16 LOOKING SOUTHWEST AT TREES/VEGETATION OUTSIDE DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Loulaville, Ky 40299 (502) 267-0700	amec®		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY		-
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE:	11/15/10
		CHKTD BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-4	0183.0001
TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX:	B-20



2-17 LOOKING SOUTHWEST FROM NORTH EMBANKMENT



2-18 LOOKING NORTH AT RAILROAD TRACKS AND EMBANKMENT THROUGH PROPERTY BOUNDARY FENCE

AMEC Earth & Environmental 690 Commonwealth Center 11003 Bluegrass Parkway Louisville, Ky 40299 (502) 287-0700	amec		CLIENT UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	
PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF DAM SAFETY OF COAL COMBUSTION SURFACE IMPOUNDMENTS		DWN BY: CAE	DATUM:	DATE: 11/15/10
WESTAR ENERGY TECUMSEH ENERGY CENTER, TECUMSEH, KS AREA 2 PHOLO LOGS		CHK'D BY: MOS	REV. NO.:	PROJECT NO: 3-2106-0183.0001
		PROJECTION:	SCALE: AS SHOWN	APPENDIX: B-21

APPENDIX C Inventory of Provided Materials

- ICR Response 4' Rectangular Weir Without End Contractions Flow.pdf 2010 Golder\_TEC Vegetation Memo.pdf Attachment 1.pdf Attachment 2.pdf Attachment 3.pdf TEC 1980 NP-4 Primary Ash Pond Modification.pdf TEC 1980 NP-5 Primary Ash Pond Outflow Structure Modification.pdf TEC 1982 DRP-1 Ash Site Map with truck route.pdf TEC 1984 NP84-1 Final Ash Pond and Coal Pile Runoff Pond.PDF TEC 1984 NP84-2 Primary Ash Pond Outflow Structure Modification.pdf TEC 2008 Outfall #002 - Site Plan.pdf TEC 2008 Outfall #002 Weir Box.pdf TEC 2009 Golder Ash Pond Stability Eval Report.pdf TEC 2009 ICR Response - Scanned Copy.pdf TEC 2010 Golder Ash Pond Stability Follow Up Report 22OCT10.pdf TEC Ash Pond Berm Contours Circa 1968.pdf TEC Ash Pond Berm Redesign IFC 9-3-10.pdf TEC Cinder Pit Overflow Drain Evaluation.pdf TEC NPDES Flow Diagram Drawing.pdf TEC Permit 10.01.08.PDF TEC Pond Narratives.pdf TEC Site Contours Circa 1968 (Negative).pdf
- tecumseh cross section.pdf
- tecumseh\_RRFI.pdf