### **SCS ENGINEERS**



### Unstable Areas Compliance Demonstration Lansing Landfill

### **Lansing Power Station**

Prepared for:

### Interstate Power and Light Company

Lansing Generating Station 2320 Power Plant Drive Lansing, Iowa 52151

Prepared by:

### **SCS ENGINEERS**

2830 Dairy Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53718-6751 (608) 224-2830

> October 2018 File No. 25218081.00

**Offices Nationwide www.scsengineers.com**

#### **Unstable Areas Compliance Demonstration Lansing Landfill**

**Lansing Power Station**

Prepared for:

**Interstate Power and Light Company** Lansing Generating Station 2320 Power Plant Drive Lansing, Iowa 52151

Prepared by:

**SCS ENGINEERS** 2830 Dairy Drive Madison, Wisconsin 53718-6751 (608) 224-2830

> October 2018 File No. 25218081.00

### Table of Contents



### **Figures**

- 1 Site Location Map<br>2 Existina Conditions
- **Existing Conditions**

#### **Appendices**

- A Site Description and Geologic Summary
- B Liquefaction and Settlement Potential Evaluation
- C Boring Locations and Boring Logs
- D Slope Stability Evaluation
- E Seepage Potential and Karst Condition Assessment

I:\25218081.00\Deliverables\Unstable Areas Demonstration\181010\_LAN Landfill\_Unstable Areas Restriction\_October\_2018.docx

[This page left blank intentionally]

### **P.E. Certification**



[This page left blank intentionally]

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT SUMMARY

On behalf of Interstate Power and Light Company (IPL), SCS Engineers (SCS) has prepared the enclosed Unstable Areas Compliance Demonstration for the Lansing Landfill (existing coal combustion residual [CCR] landfill) as required by 40 CFR 257.64.

**Figure 1** shows the site location. **Figure 2** shows the Lansing Landfill location.

### 2.0 UNSTABLE AREAS RESTRICTION

### **257.64** *"Unstable areas."*

*"(a) An existing or new CCR landfill, existing or new CCR surface impoundment, or any lateral expansion of a CCR unit must not be located in an unstable area unless the owner or operator demonstrates by the dates specified in paragraph (d) of this section that recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices have been incorporated into the design of the CCR unit to ensure that the integrity of the structural components of the CCR unit will not be disrupted."*

*"(b) The owner or operator must consider all of the following factors, at a minimum, when determining whether an area is unstable:*

*"(1) On-site or local soil conditions that may result in significant differential settling;*

As discussed in **Appendices A** and **B**, and as shown by the boring location plans and boring logs from the 2001 Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation prepared by BT2, Inc., and the 2017 Monitoring Well Construction Documentation prepared by SCS Engineers (see **Appendix C**), the Lansing Landfill CCR unit is not located in on-site or local soil conditions that may result in significant differential settling. The site soils below the landfill consist primarily of sand and gravel weathered from bedrock overlying relatively competent bedrock. Based on the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) blow counts on the boring logs in **Appendix C**, the soils are typically medium dense to very dense and therefore not susceptible to appreciable differential settlement that would affect the performance of the landfill.

*(2) On-site or local geologic or geomorphologic features; and*

As discussed in **Appendices A**, **B**, and **E**, and shown by the boring logs in **Appendix C**, the Lansing Landfill CCR unit is not located in on-site or local geologic or geomorphologic features that are unstable. The boring logs show primarily medium to very dense sand and gravel overlying bedrock below the landfill. Borings in the landfill perimeter berm encountered primarily medium dense sand and stiff clay fill soils. These geologic features provide a stable foundation for the CCR landfill. This assessment is confirmed by the slope stability

evaluation in **Appendix D** that indicates the slope stability safety factor is acceptable.

*(3) On-site or local human-made features or events (both surface and subsurface)."*

As shown by the boring location plans and boring logs in **Appendix C**, the Lansing Landfill CCR unit is not located in on-site or local human-made features or events (both surface and subsurface) that are unstable.

As discussed in **Appendix E**, groundwater or surface water is unlikely to cause instability. The facility is designed with adequate run-on and run-off control systems. Groundwater monitoring wells near the landfill perimeter berm show that groundwater hydraulic gradients are downward and therefore groundwater is unlikely to negatively impact the performance of the facility.

### 3.0 REFERENCES

- A. BT2, Inc., 2001, Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation, Alliant Energy Lansing Power Station.
- B. SCS Engineers, 2017, Monitoring Well Construction Documentation, Soil and Hydrogeologic Investigation, IPL Lansing Generating Station.
- C. Terracon, 1996, Preliminary Subsurface Investigation, Proposed Fly Ash Embankment, Interstate Power Company, Lansing, Iowa.

### **FIGURES**

- Site Location Map
- Existing Conditions



1:25218081.00\Drawings\Site Location Map.dwg, 9/14/2018 11:11:54 AM





I:\25218081.00\Drawings\Existing Conditions.dwg, 9/18/2018 11:19:35 AM

NOTES:

- 1. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF EXISTING LANDFILL GRADES WITHIN LIMITS<br>OF WASTE WAS COMPLETED BY MOHN SURVEYING IN APRIL 2015,<br>SEPTEMBER 2015, OCTOBER 2015, AND IN MARCH 2018.
- 2. EXISTING GRADES OUTSIDE THE LIMIT OF WASTE ARE BASED ON KBM,<br>INC. AERIAL SURVEY COMPLETED ON APRIL 18, 2001.



### **APPENDIX A**

Site Description and Geologic Summary

### **Site Description and Geologic Summary**

### **Site Information**

The Lansing Ash Disposal Area encompasses approximately 13 acres, and is located in an agricultural area near the Mississippi River. The site location is the Southwest ¼ of Section 2, T98N, R3W located in Allamakee County, Iowa. The landfill is bounded by a bluff to the northeast and by County Highway X52 to the southwest. CCR ash ponds are located directly west of the landfill and a perimeter berm surrounds the landfill on the south and east sides.

### **Regional Geology**

A summary of the regional hydrogeologic stratigraphy is presented in **Attachment A1**. A regional bedrock surface hydrogeologic map is shown in **Attachment A2**. Regional hydrogeologic cross-sections are shown in **Attachment A2**. The bedrock surface elevation is highly variable due to erosion; the landscape is made up of steep hills and valleys, and the landfill site is located in a valley. The uppermost bedrock unit in the site area is the Jordan Sandstone, which is the lower Cambrian-Ordovician sandstone interbedded with dolostone. Borings MW-5, MW-6, MW-18, MW-19, and MW-22P encountered sandstone bedrock in the area of the landfill. Boring logs for these wells are included in **Appendix C**. The well locations are shown on a figure in **Appendix C**.

**Attachment A3** shows locations of known sinkholes and potential karst areas in the vicinity of the Lansing site. The site is within an area identified as "karst or potential karst," however this is due to the presence of a sinkhole on the bluff along the Mississippi River rather than to identified karst features on the landfill site. The elevation of the mapped sinkhole location is approximately 300 feet above the landfill site elevation. The Galena Group, composed primarily of limestone and dolostone, is known to contain karst features within Allamakee County and is stratigraphically above the sandstone unit observed in borings at the landfill site. Bedrock of the Galena Group has not been observed in borings at the Lansing landfill; the uppermost bedrock unit observed in borings MW-5, MW-6, MW-18, MW-19, and MW-22P is the Jordan Sandstone. Because the borings (**Appendix C**) near the landfill did not encounter karst features or limestone bedrock that is likely to contain karst features, it is unlikely that karst conditions are present below the landfill.

The thickness of the Jordan Sandstone aquifer varies from 50 to more than 120 feet thick in most areas of Allamakee County. Underlying the Cambrian-Ordovician sandstone are the Cambrian confining beds comprised of dolostone, siltstone, and shale. The Cambrian confining beds overly the Dresbach aquifer, composed of shaly sandstone. **Attachment A4** shows the elevation of the top of the Cambrian-Ordovician sandstone in northeastern Iowa.

Unconsolidated alluvial material, which is up to 60 feet thick within the deeply incised valley where the Lansing Generating Station, landfill, and CCR ponds are located, is thin to absent on the surrounding bluffs and hilltops. Unconsolidated deposits at the site consist of sand, silt, silty clay, organic silt, and gravel.

### **Previous Geologic Investigations**

The vicinity of the landfill site was investigated by Terracon in 1996, by BT2, Inc. in 2000, and by SCS Engineers in 2017 by performing approximately 20 borings within and adjacent to the landfill footprint. Four of the borings were instrumented with groundwater monitoring wells. The majority of the borings extend to bedrock. Split spoon and Shelby tube samples were collected. Laboratory testing included grain size analysis, Atterberg limits, unconsolidated undrained triaxial compression, and consolidated undrained triaxial compression tests with pore water pressure measurement. The boring locations and boring logs are shown in **Appendix C**.

Based on the results of the subsurface investigations, the soils below the landfill consist primarily of sand and gravel weathered from bedrock overlying sandstone bedrock. Based on the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) blow counts on the boring logs in **Appendix C**, the soils are typically medium dense to very dense.

### **References**

BT2, Inc., 2001, Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation, Alliant Energy – Lansing Power Station.

SCS Engineers, 2017, Monitoring Well Construction Documentation, Soil and Hydrogeologic Investigation, IPL Lansing Generating Station.

Terracon, 1996, Preliminary Subsurface Investigation, Proposed Fly Ash Embankment, Interstate Power Company, Lansing, Iowa.

#### DLN/AJR/MDB/DH/EJN

I:\25218081.00\Deliverables\Unstable Areas Demonstration\Appendices\Appendix A\A\_Site Description and Geologic Summary\_1010.docx

### Table LAN-3 Regional Hydrogeologic Stratigraphy<br>a Generatina Station / SCS Enaineers Proiect #2521 Lansing Generating Station / SCS Engineers Project #25215053<br>-



\*Age determinations as used on COSUNA charts published by AAPG-USGS Source: "Water Resources of Southeast Iowa," <u>Iowa Geologic Survey Water Atlas No. 4</u>. l:\25215053\Data\Tables\Table 2\_Regional Hydrogeologic Stratigraphy.doc





Source: Horick, Paul J., Water Resources of Northeast Iowa, Iowa Department of Natural Resources Water Atlas Number 8, October



Figure 32. Hydrogeologic cross-sections

### Sinkholes and Potential Karst Areas in



Source: Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Geodata, "Karst and Sinkholes in Iowa", December 14, 2017.



Figure 38. Altitude of the top of the St. Peter (upper Cambrian-Ordovician) aquifer

Source: Horick, Paul J., Water Resources of Northeast Iowa, Iowa Department of Natural Resources Water Atlas Number 8, October

### **APPENDIX B**

Liquefaction and Settlement Potential Evaluation

### **Liquefaction and Settlement Potential Evaluation**

Based on the results of the site investigation borings and laboratory testing performed by BT2, Inc., the landfill site soils are not subject to liquefaction or settlement concerns for the performance of the landfill.

Liquefaction is the process by which a saturated, loose, cohesionless soil influenced by external forces suddenly loses its shear strength and behave as a fluid. The external forces result from ground motion from an earthquake. The landfill site soils in borings consist primarily of medium dense to very dense sands and gravels that are not subject to liquefaction. In addition, liquefaction is not a concern given the low magnitude (less than 0.04g, 2 percent in 50 years) of maximum ground accelerations expected in the area; see **Attachment B1**.

Settlement below a landfill can be a concern if the facility is underlain by extensive soft, fine-grained soils. Soft soils are subject to consolidation settlement depending on the load over the soft soils. The landfill site soils consist of medium dense to very dense sands and gravels that are not subject to consolidation settlement, so settlement is not a concern for the performance of the landfill.

#### **References**

BT2, Inc., 2001, Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation, Alliant Energy – Lansing Power Station.

USGS seismic impact zones map website: <https://earthquake.usgs.gov/static/lfs/nshm/conterminous/2014/2014pga2pct.pdf>

#### DLN/AJR/EJN

I:\25218081.00\Deliverables\Unstable Areas Demonstration\Appendices\Appendix B\B\_Liquefaction and Settlement Potential Evaluation\_0926.docx



### **Two-percent probability of exceedance in 50 years map of peak ground acceleration**

Source: USGS seismic impact zones map - https://earthquake.usgs.gov/static/lfs/nshm/conterminous/2014/2014pga2pct.pdf

### **APPENDIX C**

Boring Locations and Boring Logs

### **ATTACHMENT B**

### SOIL BORING LOCATION MAP

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}dx$ 



 $*+46.52$ 

**DE HAUL ROAD** 

### LEGEND

1 2 1996 BORING LOCATION SPT1 · 2000 BORING LOCATION CPT1: CONE PENETRATION TEST LOCATION **SPT2/MW10 +** WATER TABLE MONITORING WELL

### NOTES:

- BASE MAP OBTAINED FROM HOWARD R. GREEN<br>COMPANY SHEET NO. 8 DATED MAY 1997, JOB NO.<br>717680JO3.  $\overline{1}$
- 2. LOCATIONS OF BORINGS 1-7 WERE OBTAINED FROM<br>TERRACON BORING LOCATION DIAGRAM DATED<br>SEPTEMBER 13, 1996, JOB NO. 06967025.
- 3. 2000 BORING AND CONE PENETRATION TEST<br>LOCATIONS WERE SURVEYED BY KEITH NOTBOHM<br>SURVEYING, MADISON, WISCONSIN, ON DECEMBER 6,<br>2000.



PROJECT NO. 1792

DRAWN BY: KP CHECKED BY: DN

J:\1792\TBLOCK1.DWG

DRAWN: 12/20/00 REVISED: 12/20/00

BORING AND CONE TEST LOCATIONS

ASH DISPOSAL AREA<br>ALLIANT ENERGY<br>LANSING, IOWA

BTI

**The** 

**SHEET** 

OF

### **ATTACHMENT D**

### LOG OF TEST BORINGS (BOART LONGYEAR) **WELL DETAIL LOG OF TEST BORING-GENERAL NOTES** UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM **ABANDONMENT FORMS**





 $\begin{picture}(20,20) \put(0,0){\dashbox{0.5}(20,0){ }} \put(15,0){\dashbox{0.5}(20,0){ }} \put(25,0){\dashbox{0.5}(20,0){ }} \put(25,0){\dashbox{$ 



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 







## CGC, Inc.

### **LOG OF TEST BORING**

**General Notes** 

#### **Descriptive Soil Classification**

#### **GRAIN SIZE TERMINOLOGY**



Plasticity characteristics differentiate between silt and clay.

#### **GENERAL TERMINOLOGY**



Glacial, alluvial, eolian, residual, etc.

#### **RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF** OF COHESIONLESS SOILS



#### ORGANIC CONTENT BY **COMBUSTION METHOD**



### RELATIVE DENSITY



#### **CONSISTENCY**



#### **PLASTICITY**



The penetration resistance, N, is the summation of the number of blows required to effect two successive 6" penetrations of the 2" split-barrel sampler. The sampler is driven with a 140 lb. weight falling 30" and is seated to a depth of 6" before commencing the standard penetration test.

### **SYMBOLS**

DRILLING AND SAMPLING CS-Continuous Sampling RC--Rock Coring: Size AW, BW, NW, 2"W

RQD-Rock Quality Designator RB-Rock Bit FT--Fish Tail DC-Drove Casing C--Casing: Size 2 1/2", NW, 4", HW CW-Clear Water DM-Drilling Mud HSA-Hollow Stem Auger FA-Flight Auger **HA-Hand Auger** COA-Clean-Out Auger SS-2" Diameter Split-Barrel Sample 2ST-2" Diameter Thin-Walled Tube Sample 3ST-3" Diameter Thin-Walled Tube Sample PT-3" Diameter Piston Tube Sample AS-Auger Sample **WS-Wash Sample** PTS-Peat Sample PS-Pitcher Sample NR-No Recovery S-Sounding PMT-Borehole Pressuremeter Test VS-Vane Shear Test **WPT-Water Pressure Test** 

#### **LABORATORY TESTS**

q<sub>a</sub>--Penetrometer Reading, tons/sq. ft. q<sub>u</sub>-Unconfined Strength, tons/sq. ft. W-Moisture Content, % LL-Liquid Limit, % PL-Plastic Limit. % SL-Shrinkage Limit, % LI-Loss on Ignition, % D--Dry Unit Weight, Ibs/cu, ft. pH-Measure of Soil Alkalinity or Acidity FS--Free Swell, %

#### **WATER LEVEL MEASUREMENT**

 $\nabla$  -Water Level at time shown NW-No Water Encountered WD-While Drilling **BCR-Before Casing Removal ACR-After Casing Removal** CW--Caved and Wet CM--Caved and Moist

Note: Water level measurements shown on the boring logs represent conditions at the time indicated and may not reflect static levels, especially in cohesive soils.

### **ATTACHMENT E**

### PREVIOUS TERRACON REPORT

# **APPENDIX**

**I** Terracon


# **GENERAL NOTES**

### DRILLING & SAMPLING SYMBOLS:



Standard "N" Penetration: Blows per foot of a 140 pound hammer falling 30 inches on a 2 inch OD split spoon, except where noted.

### **WATER LEVEL MEASUREMENT SYMBOLS:**



Water levels indicated on the boring logs are the levels measured in the borings at the times indicated. In pervious soils, the indicated levels may reflect the location of groundwater. In low permeability soils, the accurate determination of ground water levels is not possible with only short term observations.

## DESCRIPTIVE SOIL CLASSIFICATION:

Soil Classification is based on the Unified Soil Classification System and ASTM Designations D-2487 and D-2488. Coarse Grained Soils have more than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; they are described as: boulders, cobbles, gravel or sand. Fine Grained Soils have less than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; they are described as: clays, if they are plastic, and silts if they are slightly plastic or non-plastic. Major constituents may be added as modifiers and minor constituents may be added according to the relative proportions based on grain size. In addition to gradation, coarse grained soils are defined on the basis of their relative in-place density and fine grained soils on the basis of their consistency. Example: Lean clay with sand, trace gravel, stiff (CL); silty sand, trace gravel, medium dense (SM).

#### CONSISTENCY OF FINE-GRAINED SOILS:

#### **Unconfined Compressive**

Strength, Qu, psf Consistency  $< 500$ Very Soft  $500 - 1.000$ Soft  $1,001 - 2,000$ Medium  $2.001 - 4.000$ **Stiff**  $4,001 - 8,000$ Very Stiff 8,001 -16,000 Hard  $> -16.000$ Very Hard

### RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF SAND AND GRAVEL



### RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF FINES

 $\frac{1}{2}$  12



### RELATIVE DENSITY OF COARSE-GRAINED SOILS:

N-Blows/ft.

# **Relative Density**



# **GRAIN SIZE TERMINOLOGY**



Tierracor

Modifier



# UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM



Primarily organic matter, dark in color, and organic odor

<sup>A</sup>Based on the material passing the 3-in. (75-mm) sieve.

<sup>B</sup>If field sample contained cobbles or boulders, or both, add "with cobbles or<br>boulders, or both" to group name.

<sup>C</sup>Gravels with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols:

GW-GM well-graded gravel with silt GW-GC well-graded gravel with clay GP-GM poorly graded gravel with silt

GP-GC poorly graded gravel with clay <sup>D</sup>Sands with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols:

SW-SM well-graded sand with silt SW-SC well-graded sand with clay

SP-SM poorly graded sand with silt

SP-SC poorly graded sand with clay

 $(D_{30})^2$  $ECu = D_{sd}/D_{ro}$  $Cc =$  $\overline{D_{\pi 0} \times D_{60}}$ 

 $F$ If soil contains  $\geq 15\%$  sand, add "with sand" to group name.

<sup>G</sup>If fines classify as CL-ML use dual symbol GC-GM, or SC-SM.

<sup>H</sup>If fines are organic, add "with organic fines" to group name.

If soil contains  $\geq 15\%$  gravel, add "with gravel" to group name.

<sup>J</sup>If Atterberg limits plot in shaded area, soil is a CL-ML, silty clay.

<sup>K</sup>If soil contains 15 to 29% plus No. 200, add "with sand" or "with gravel", whichever is predominant.

<sup>L</sup>If soil contains  $\geq 30\%$  plus. No. 200 predominantly sand, add "sandy" to group name.

"If soil contains  $\geq 30\%$  plus No. 200, predominantly gravel, add "gravelly" to group name.

 $P = 4$  and plots on or above "A" line.

 $^{0}$ PI < 4 or plots below "A" line.

PPI plots on or above "A" line.

<sup>O</sup>PI plots below "A" line.





 $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{67025}{2} \right)^2}$ 

**xaaradad** 



N3BLGE 67025 9/16/98



N3BLGE 67025 9/16/96



 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{2}}}$ 





NJBLGE 67025 9/16/96



1/310 GE 67026 9716/96

 $\bar{\gamma}$ 



 $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$ 

1130106 67025 9716/96



N3BLGE 67025 9/16/96



NJBLGE 67025 9/16/96





राष्ट्र

 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

a management of the state o





NJBLGE 67025 9/16/96

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 





**N'HRGL 67026 9/16/90** 

 $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ 



J.



SITE PLAN



I:\25216070.00\Drawings\Site Plan.dwg, 11/28/2016 3:20:26 PM



 $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{array}{ccccc} \frac{1}{2} & & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & & & \\ & & \frac{1}{2} & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array}$ 





 $\sim$ 



 $\label{eq:3.1} \langle \bullet \rangle$ 

 $\label{eq:1} \overline{\mu}$ 

### **SCS ENGINEERS**

Environmental Consultants and Contractors

SOIL BORING LOG INFORMATION

Route To:

Watershed/Wastewater  $\square$ Remediation/Redevelopment  $\square$  Waste Management  $\quad \Box$ Other  $\ \Box$ 



I hereby certify that the information on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.



# SOIL BORING LOG INFORMATION SUPPLEMENT  $\text{Form }4400\text{-}122\text{A}$









**SCS ENGINEERS** 

**Environmental Consultants and Contractors** 

Fax:

Route To:

Watershed/Wastewater  $\Box$ Remediation/Redevelopment □ Waste Management  $\ \Box$ Other  $\quad \Box$ 



I hereby certify that the information on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Firm SCS Engineers<br>2830 Dairy Drive Madison, WI 53718 Signature Tel: (608)224-2830  $h$ nn







## **SCS ENGINEERS**

**Environmental Consultants and Contractors** 

SOIL BORING LOG INFORMATION

Route To:

Watershed/Wastewater  $\quad \Box$ Remediation/Redevelopment  $\square$  Waste Management  $\Box$ Other  $\Box$ 





I hereby certify that the information on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

 $\cdot$ 








# **APPENDIX D**

Slope Stability Evaluation



January 2, 2001

Ms. Linda Lynch **Alliant Energy** 222 W. Washington Ave. P.O. Box 192 Madison, WI 53701-0192

Mr. Ted Shonts **Alliant Energy** 2320 Power Plant Drive Lansing, IA 52151-7539

> SUBJECT: Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation **Alliant Energy - Lansing Power Station** BT<sup>2</sup> Project #1792

Dear Ms. Lynch and Mr. Shonts:

This report provides the results of a slope stability evaluation for the proposed expansion of the ash disposal area at the Lansing Power Station. Slope stability had been identified as a potential barrier to vertical expansion of the ash disposal area in previous analysis performed by Terracon Consultants, Inc. Terracon noted the apparent very loose/soft condition of the existing ash fill based on conventional borings using the standard penetration test. In BT<sup>2</sup>'s Ash Fill Options Evaluation report, dated August 22, 2000, we indicated that vertical expansion of the ash disposal area was potentially feasible and could provide cost-effective ash disposal by filling over the existing plateau area without raising the height of the existing perimeter soil berm. To evaluate this option further, we recommended additional borings, field cone penetration testing of the ash fill to assess its strength and settlement characteristics, geotechnical laboratory testing, and analysis of the slope stability of the proposed expansion.

The stability analysis was performed by CGC, Inc., of Madison, Wisconsin, under subcontract to BT<sup>2</sup>. CGC's report is attached to this letter.

#### **Description of the Proposed Expansion**

The stability analysis was performed based on the preliminary design for the disposal area expansion that was outlined in the previous Ash Fill Options Evaluation report. A map and two cross sections showing the proposed design are attached as Figures 1 through 3. The key design and operations assumptions that were incorporated into the analysis are based on the following project description.

For the proposed vertical expansion of the existing ash disposal area, ash fill will be placed over the existing ash in the plateau area. Construction of the expansion will involve preparing the site for ash filling, constructing surface water drainage controls, dredging and dewatering the ash, hauling and placing the ash, and constructing a final cover. Unlike the existing ash disposal area, construction of the

Ms. Linda Lynch and Mr. Ted Shonts January 2, 2001 Page 2

vertical expansion will not involve construction of perimeter berms with relatively steep exterior side slopes, to be filled with ash. Instead, ash will be placed within the limits of the existing berms, at a maximum slope of 4 horizontal to 1 vertical  $(4H:1V)$ .

The two attached cross sections (**Figures 2** and 3) show the proposed expansion with  $4H:1V$  slopes on both the berm side and the bluff side of the disposal area. A possible additional expansion area is also shown, based on filling against the existing bluff. With the additional expansion option, ash would be placed at a 4H:1V slope up to approximately the center of the existing disposal area, then at a 20H:1V slope up to the bluff. For the stability analysis, CGC made the conservative assumption that the additional expansion area would be filled.

Prior to placing ash in the plateau area, vegetated areas will be cleared and grubbed and any existing cover soils will be removed and stockpiled for reuse in the new final cover. The existing ash stock piles will be leveled and compacted prior to placement of new ash. In addition, berms and other stormwater diversion structures will be constructed to divert water away from active fill areas. We assume that ash will be placed to a maximum height of approximately 40 feet above the existing elevation of the plateau area. Following the placement of the ash, a final cover consisting of 2 feet of compacted soil, 6 inches of rooting zone soil, and 6 inches of top soil will be placed, along with seed, fertilizer, and mulch. The cover could be constructed over several years as phases of the landfill expansion are filled to final grades.

We assume that the ash will be dredged and dewatered on-site near the ash sluice pond. We also assume that ash dredging, dewatering, hauling, and placement will occur over a 10-year period.

#### **Stability Analysis**

The stability analysis for the proposed vertical expansion of the ash disposal area included the following tasks:

- Additional borings in the perimeter soil berm (5) and one boring in the ash fill;
- Installation of a water table monitoring well in the berm;
- Cone penetration tests in the ash (4) and one test in the soil berm;
- Geotechnical laboratory testing; and
- $\bullet$ Slope stability analysis (3 sections).

The results of the stability analysis indicate that vertical expansion of the ash disposal area is geotechnically feasible. For the proposed design, the analysis indicated safety factors ranging from 1.55 to 2.32, based on varying sets of assumed soil parameters. Minimum acceptable safety factors for a project of this type are in the range of 1.3 to 1.5. The only scenario that yielded a safety factor of less than 2 was based on the results from a boring near the south end of the berm, where some soft soils were encountered in the berm.

The details of the analysis methods and results are presented in the attached report prepared by CGC.

Ms. Linda Lynch and Mr. Ted Shonts January 2, 2001 Page 3

#### **Recommendations**

If Alliant chooses to move forward with the development of the proposed expansion of the ash disposal area, the next step in the process will be to obtain IDNR approval. To complete the permitting process, we anticipate that the following steps will need to be implemented:

- $\bullet$ Obtain current topography of the plateau area.
- Locate existing monitoring wells and install new monitoring wells (assume two new wells).
- Collect hydrogeologic data and groundwater quality data.
- Evaluate operational options for ash dredging, dewatering, and hauling/placement.
- Develop design/permit drawings and specifications and perform associated calculations.
- Prepare feasibility report presenting data collected and analysis performed with updated construction cost estimate.
- $\bullet$ Submit permit application to IDNR.

The estimated cost for these tasks in our August 2000 Ash Fill Options Evaluation report was \$37,400.

It may also be beneficial to discuss the potential expansion with the IDNR and obtain clarification and approval for the scope of work to be performed for the permit application.

If you have any questions concerning this report, please call us at 608-224-2830. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you on this project.

Sincerely,  $BT^2$ , Inc.

The Ph

Sherren Clark, P.G., P.E. **Project Manager** 

Debra Nelson

Debra Nelson, P.E. **Senior Engineer** 

Attachments: Figures 1-3 Appendix - CGC Report

cc: Mike Schultz, CGC

I:\1792\Reports\0012stability\_rpt.wpd

BT<sup>2</sup>, Inc., 2830 Dairy Drive, Madison, WI 53718-6751, Ph. (608) 224-2830, FAX (608) 224-2839







 $\frac{3}{5}$ Allmot Lansing -1792<br>Volume Cales - 0ption B<br>7/28/-RR Possible additional<br>expansion area<br>(not included in<br>volume or costs) Figure 2  $550$  $600$ 



SAMSAN (SINASI SIYASI SINASI SINASI SINASI) Existing Ground<br>Existing Ash<br>Disposal

 $250$ 

ါဝံစ

 $50$ 

 $7\omega$ 

 $150$ 

Existing<br>Berm

 $200$ 

 $\mathfrak{z}\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{o}$ 

ికం

USANASI ARAKA

 $400$ 

 $45a$ 

 $500$ 

 $B$  $\frac{4}{5}$ Alliant-Lansing<br>Valume Cales - Option B<br>1/28/00 RR Possible additional<br>expansion area<br>(not included in<br>volume or costs)  $A_{19A}$  = 4,000 sF madre Trat Aire Figure 3  $560$  $\sim$ 



Construction - Geotechnical Consulting Engineering/Testing

January 2, 2001 C<sub>2</sub>0207

Ms. Sherren Clark  $BT^2$ . Inc. 2830 Dairy Drive Madison, WI 53718

Re: Subsurface Investigation Fly Ash Landfill Expansion **Alliant Energy Site** Lansing, Iowa

Dear Ms. Clark:

CGC, Inc. has completed the geotechnical investigation for the potential expansion to the fly ash landfill at the Alliant Energy site in Lansing, Iowa. This report presents the findings of the exploration program consisting of Standard Penetration Test (SPT) borings, Cone Penetration Test (CPT) probes, field density tests and laboratory tests. The report also provides slope stability analyses for the proposed vertical expansion to the landfill. CGC's analysis and report were performed under subcontract to  $BT^2$ .

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Our understanding of the potential landfill expansion is as follows. The landfill expansion option involves increasing the capacity of the existing landfill by vertically expanding the present fly ash surface about 40 ft above the existing plateau area. The plateau area was created by placing ash within a basin created by the construction of an earthen dike along the west and north edges of the landfill area. Expansion will establish a new fly ash landfill height at about EL 743 using 4H:1V exterior slopes and a 20H:1V slope extending from the peak to the original bluff slope. A final cover measuring about 3 ft thick will be placed over the ash, with berms and diversion ditches also to be constructed to control surface water runoff. Fly ash will be dredged and dewatered on site prior to placement, with placement to be done over a 10-year period using truck hauling and dozer spreading/compaction.

#### **INVESTIGATION**

The subsurface conditions of the existing plateau area were investigated by drilling six SPT borings on the present fly ash surface or perimeter dike. Five CPT probes were also conducted on the ash or dike until probe refusal occurred. Locations of the SPT and CPT borings/probes are presented in Attachment B. A sixth location was planned (CPT-5), but could not be conducted because access to the area was prevented by snow.

The SPT borings were drilled by Boart-Longyear (under subcontract to BT<sup>2</sup>) on November 27 and 28, 2000. The boring logs are presented in Attachment D. The CPT probes were conducted by Stratigraphics on November 21, 2000, with that data presented in Attachment C. A monitoring well (MW-10) was also installed in SPT-2 by Boart-Longyear to a depth of 29 ft. Additional details regarding drilling and sampling are described in Attachment A.



Ms. Sherren Clark  $BT^2$ , Inc. January 2, 2001 Page 2

The SPT soil borings and CPT probes reveal that fly ash extends to depths averaging near 35 ft in the northern portion of the basin. The ash thickness tapers off going toward the south. The ash is generally a mix of loose to medium dense sand size particles and/or soft to stiff silt and clay size particles. It is underlain by a weathered rock zone followed by more competent dolomite. The confining berm to the west is generally comprised of medium dense sands and relatively stiff clays. As an exception, the dike near CPT-6 has a tendency to be softer and less dense.

Additional soil borings were conducted by Terracon as part of a study done in 1996. That information is contained in Attachment E of this submittal. Conditions were similar, with the fly ash depths extending to 44 ft in one of their borings.

Free standing groundwater was generally not encountered in the SPT borings or well MW-10. The CPT data suggests a perched condition on the surface of the weathered bedrock/dolomite (refer to "generated pore pressure" column on "CPTU-EC log with Lithologic Evaluation" data sheet for each CPT probe in Attachment C).

#### **LABORATORY TESTING**

A sample of the fly ash was obtained by CGC in conjunction with CPT activities on November 21, 2000. It was obtained from on-site stockpiles and appeared to have a grain size distribution that was representative of some of the finest (i.e., least coarse) material on site. This material was selected because it is more susceptible to slope stability failure than the coarse-grained ash. Atterberg limits and grain size/hydrometer tests were performed on that sample by CGC, with those results presented in Attachment F. The results indicate that the tested sample has soil properties that would classify it as a silt.

Two sand cone field density tests on similar ash were conducted by CGC in the field on November 21 and revealed a wet density of 82 pcf for both tests.

Samples of the fly ash from the stockpiles were submitted to the UW Madison geotechnical laboratory for triaxial testing to evaluate shear strength parameters for implementation during slope stability modeling. A series of three unconsolidated-undrained (UU) tests were conducted on ash samples compacted to 82 pcf at moisture contents of 25%, 35% and 45% to simulate anticipated field conditions in the short term. Two additional consolidated-undrained (CU) tests with pore pressure measurements were also done to simulate long term conditions. The results of these tests are presented in Attachment F. Strength test results from<br>the UU and CU laboratory testing found in Appendix F correlate well with data obtained from the CPT<br>probes for the Database" under the drained friction angle and undrained shear strength columns.



Ms. Sherren Clark  $BT^2$ . Inc. January 2, 2001 Page 3

#### **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the laboratory testing and field analysis, a series of cross-sections of the proposed expansion area were evaluated from a slope stability viewpoint. The slope stability evaluation revealed that the proposed expansion is feasible because resulting safety factors against movement exceed typical acceptable levels. The following paragraphs present the stability analysis results, along with soil parameters used in the conceptual design. Important information about the limitations of this report is presented in Attachment H.

Incorporating soil parameters determined from CPT, SPT, field density and laboratory testing programs, CGC performed a slope stability analysis using the computer program STABL5. The program uses the Modified Bishop Method of analysis to calculate factors of safety against sliding along various semicircular arcs, accounting for soil loads, soil shear strength, water levels and other factors.

Key assumptions used in these analyses include the following:

- Soil profile: A soil profile consisting of a composite of the SPT and CPT borings was developed by roughly averaging existing ash depths and natural layer thicknesses. We analyzed for the full expansion option that includes a 20H:1V slope extending from the initial peak at EL 743 to the original bluff slope. This configuration would be more critical from a slope stability point of view than just the initial phase of the vertical expansion. The assumed soil profile is indicated in the figures in Attachment G.
- Water level: Based on water levels encountered in the recent borings, the slope was modeled with groundwater at the base of the existing ash fill.
- Ash Shear Strength Parameters: Because the ash will be placed in the landfill at a relatively slow rate and the ash is moderately permeable, both the existing and future ash fill is expected to develop its shear strength primarily from frictional resistance. Using parameters determined from CU shear strength testing which correlated well with in-situ CPT data, we have conservatively modeled the fly ash as material with a friction angle of 29° and zero cohesion. (Note that the triaxial laboratory testing and CPT probe strength data suggests friction angles as great as approximately 42° on the average could be considered for modeling).
- Potential Weak Zone in Earth Berm: To model the zone of the existing embankment near CPT/SPT 6, where somewhat loose/soft conditions were noted, we used lower strength soil parameters for the earth berm in several analyses. Because the berm fill at this location is a mixture of clay and sand, the analyses were conducted assuming the fill would behave as both a frictional and cohesive material. Shear strength parameters were estimated based on correlations with SPT blow count values and pocket penetrometer readings.



Ms. Sherren Clark  $BT^2$ . Inc. January 2, 2001 Page 4

> Failure Plane Analysis: To fully evaluate various modes of failure, parameters in the STABL program were modified to force the potential slip circles through critical sections of the slope. This effort was necessary to check that potential failure surfaces with the lowest factors of safety had been identified. The two modes are identified as "failure through ash slope" and "failure through earth berm".

Out of hundreds of trial arcs of varying radii and centers, the ten arcs with the lowest factors of safety for each condition are shown in Figures G-1 through G-6 in Attachment G. The minimum factors of safety for the proposed slope are summarized in the following table:

### **TABLE 1**

### **ESTIMATED MINIMUM FACTORS OF SAFETY** FOR THE PROPOSED ASH LANDFILL SLOPE



Note that a factor of safety of about 1.0 or less indicates incipient slope failure or a high risk of movement.

From this analysis we conclude that the calculated factor of safety for the proposed ash landfill slope is well above the minimum factor of safety of 1.3 to 1.5 desired in this case (Sowers and Sowers, 1970).

#### \*\*\*\*\*

We trust this report addresses your present needs. General limitations regarding the conclusions and opinions presented in this report are discussed in Attachment H. If you have any questions, please contact us.



Ms. Sherren Clark  $BT^2$ , Inc. January 2, 2001 Page 5

Sincerely,

CGC, INC.

Nicha ' I

Michael N. Schultz, P.E. Principal/Consulting Professional

William W Well frans

William W. Wuellner, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Encl:	Attachment A -	Field Investigation
	Attachment B -	Soil Boring Location Map
	Attachment $C -$	<b>CPT</b> Probe Report
	Attachment D -	Log of Test Borings (Boart Longyear)
		<b>Well Detail</b>
		Log of Test Boring-General Notes
		Unified Soil Classification System
		Abandonment Forms
	Attachment E -	Previous Terracon Report
	Attachment F -	<b>Laboratory Test Results</b>
	Attachment G -	Slope Stability Analyses
		• Figures G-1 through G-6
	Attachment H -	Document Qualifications
		$\alpha$ if $\alpha$ if $\alpha$ $\sim$ $\mathbf{r}$ . The set of $\mathbf{r}$

Sowers and Sowers, Introductory Soil Mechanics and Foundations, 1970, pg 517. Reference:

# **APPENDIX E**

Seepage Potential and Karst Condition Assessment

### **Seepage Potential and Karst Condition Assessment**

The landfill is designed and constructed to include a storm water run-on and run-off management system. Based on water table elevations from groundwater monitoring in 2014 through 2017, groundwater hydraulic gradients are downward near the landfill perimeter berm indicating that groundwater movement is not a concern for performance of the landfill. No leachate seepage has been observed along the landfill perimeter berms by Interstate Power and Light Company (IPL) staff or during annual landfill inspections by a qualified professional engineer, so leachate movement is not a concern for performance of the landfill. Therefore, there are currently no concerns that storm water, leachate, or groundwater movement will impact the stability of the landfill.

As noted in **Appendix A**, karst features were not observed in the borings within and adjacent to the disposal facility. Because the borings (**Appendix C**) near the landfill did not encounter karst features or limestone bedrock that is likely to contain karst features, it is unlikely that karst conditions are present below the landfill, so karst structures are not a concern at the landfill site. **References** 

BT2, Inc., 2001, Ash Disposal Area Stability Evaluation, Alliant Energy – Lansing Power Station.

SCS, 2017, 2017 Annual Water Quality Report, Lansing Generating Station CCR Landfill, Interstate Power and Light Company.

#### DLN/AJR/EJN

I:\25218081.00\Deliverables\Unstable Areas Demonstration\Appendices\Appendix E\E\_Seepage Potential and Karst Condition Assessment\_0926.docx