



VERIFICATION REPORT FOR THE CLINTON LANDFILL GAS COLLECTION AND COMBUSTION PROJECT



Document Prepared by First Environment, Inc.

Project Title	Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project
Version	3
Report ID	3

Report Title	Verification Report for the Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project
Client	3Degrees Group, Inc.
Pages	30
Date of Issue	12-March-2024
Prepared By	First Environment, Inc.
Contact	10 Park Place Building 1A, Suite 504 Butler, NJ 07405 jjd@firstenvironment.com
Approved By	Jay Wintergreen
Work Carried Out By	Jeff Daley Logan Simpson

Summary:

This report is provided to 3Degrees Group, Inc. as a deliverable of the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) project verification process for The Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project (The Project) located in Clinton, Illinois.

The Project consists of the expansion of an active landfill gas collection system that captures methane and destroys it in an open flare and in two Caterpillar engine generator sets located on -site, resulting in a net reduction of CO₂ emissions.

The verification process and scope consist of the independent third-party assessment of the implementation of the project and emission reduction assertion against the criteria stated in the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Standard, 4 October 2023, v4.5; the approved Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Methodology ACM0001 (Version 19); and the validated Project Description (PD). The purpose of the verification is to ensure the project was implemented and monitored in accordance with the validated Project Description and underlying CDM Methodology.

During the verification process, First Environment, Inc. (First Environment) issued eight corrective action requests and one clarification request, all of which were addressed sufficiently by 3Degrees Group, Inc.

No uncertainties were identified during the verification process.

The Project claims emission reductions of 92,635 metric tonnes CO₂e for the period of July 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022. First Environment is reasonably assured that the Project meets all relevant VCS program requirements and correctly applies the CDM Methodology ACM0001 (Version 19) and the validated PD (VCS PD).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Scope and Criteria	5
1.3	Level of Assurance	6
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	6
2	Verification Process	6
2.1	Method and Criteria	6
2.1.1	Conflict of Interest Review	7
2.1.2	Audit Team	7
2.1.3	Strategic Analysis and Verification Preparations	7
2.1.4	Audit Kick-off	7
2.1.5	Development of the Verification and Evidence-Gathering Plans	7
2.1.6	Execution of Evidence Gathering Activities	8
2.1.7	Site Visit	8
2.1.8	Emissions Reduction Data and Calculation Assessment	8
2.1.9	Corrective Actions and Supplemental Information	8
2.1.10	Independent Review	8
2.1.11	Verification Reporting and Opinion Issuance	8
2.2	Document Review	8
2.3	Interviews	9
2.4	Site Visits	9
2.5	Resolution of Findings	9
2.5.1	Forward Action Requests	9
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	9
3	Validation Findings	10
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	11
3.2	Methodology Deviations	11
3.3	Project Description Deviations	12
3.4	Grouped Project	14
4	Verification Findings	14
4.1	Project Implementation Status	14
4.2	Safeguards	18
4.2.1	No Net Harm	18
4.2.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	18
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	18

4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	18
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals	20
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis	20
5	Verification Opinion	20

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Resolution of Findings

APPENDIX B: List Of Documents

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

This report is provided to 3Degrees Group, Inc. (3Degrees) as a deliverable of the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) project verification process for the Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project (the “Project”) located in Clinton, Illinois. This report covers the verification of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions from the destruction of landfill gas that otherwise would be vented to the atmosphere during the period from July 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022. First Environment, Inc. (First Environment) conducted the verification from the date of the kick-off meeting through October 2, 2023.

3Degrees is the responsible party for the GHG statement under verification. 3Degrees was responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the GHG statement. First Environment is responsible for expressing the opinion below on the GHG statement based on the outcome of the verification process.

The purpose of this verification was, through review of appropriate evidence, to establish that:

- the Project conforms to the requirements of the verification criteria, including all requirements, discussed in Section 1.2 of this report; and
- the data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent, and free of material error or omission.

Verification activities also include reaching a conclusion about the accuracy of the GHG statement and the conformity of the statement with criteria.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

The specific scope metrics for the verification are outlined in the table below:

Reporting Period	• July 1, 2021 – December 31, 2022
Emission Sources Verified	<i>Baseline Sources</i> • CH4 emission reductions resulting from the destruction of landfill gas. • CH4 emission reductions resulting from the pre-project destruction of landfill gas. <i>Project Sources</i> • CO2 emissions from electricity and propane consumption by the project activity • CH4 emissions from uncombusted methane
Definition of Materiality	• Misstatements of greater than five percent of the Project’s GHG assertion • Qualitative non-conformities with Standards of Verification described below

The following table outlines the guidance and protocols used to conduct this verification:

Standards of Verification	• Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) Standard, 4 October 2023, v4.5 • Validated VCS PD (VCS PD), Version 5.1, January 18, 2022 • Approved CDM methodology ACM0001, “<i>Flaring or use of landfill gas</i>”, Version 19 (ACM0001)
Verification Process	• VCS Standard • VCS Program Guide, Version 4.4, 29 August 2023 • ISO 14064-3: Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements, 2019

The Monitoring Report dated 12 March 2024; Version 14 titled “*Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project*” was also reviewed to inform the verification assessment.

1.3 Level of Assurance

First Environment and 3Degrees have agreed that a reasonable level of assurance be applied for the Project.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

The Project is located at the Clinton Landfill, 9560 Heritage Road in Clinton, Illinois, DeWitt County (latitude and longitude are 40° 6' 51.411" and -88° 57' 28.7994," respectively). The project activity consists of the voluntary capture of landfill gas (LFG) through an expanded active collection system and destruction of this LFG in two 1.6-megawatt (MW) Caterpillar 3520C engine generator sets and an open flare (Flare #4). The Project achieves emission reductions through the destruction of methane that would have otherwise been released directly to the atmosphere.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The verification process consisted of an assessment of the Project’s implementation, as described in the Monitoring Report, against the verification criteria described above, as well as an assessment of the GHG emission reduction assertion. Discrepancies between project documentation and the verification criteria were considered material and identified for corrective action. Deviations were evaluated on the basis of the requirements in ACM0001 and the VCS Standard and required appropriate justification from 3Degrees. Deviations discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 below were validated in accordance with the requirements of the VCS Standard.

2.1 Method and Criteria

To review the Project’s GHG information, the following verification process was used:

- conflict of interest review;
- selection of Audit Team;
- Verification preparations;
- initial interaction and kick-off meeting with 3Degrees;
- development of the verification and evidence gathering plans;
- execution;

- site visit;
- assessment and evaluation of raw data, calculations, and supporting documentation for the period under review;
- follow-up interaction with 3Degrees for corrective action or supplemental data as needed;
- independent review; and
- final opinion and report submittal.

The verification process was utilized to gain an understanding of the Project's GHG emission sources and reductions and to evaluate and verify the collection and handling of data, the calculations that lead to the results, and the means for reporting the associated data and results.

2.1.1 Conflict of Interest Review

Prior to beginning any verification project, First Environment conducts an evaluation to identify any potential conflicts of interest associated with the project. No potential conflicts were found for this project.

2.1.2 Audit Team

First Environment's Audit Team consisted of the following individuals who were selected based on their verification experience, as well as familiarity with landfill gas projects:

Jeff Daley – Lead Auditor
Logan Simpson - Auditor
James Wintergreen – Internal Reviewer

2.1.3 Strategic Analysis and Verification Preparations

First Environment performed pre-engagement activities to confirm the type of engagement, level of assurance, materiality thresholds, the objectives, criteria, and scope for verification activities. The Audit Team reviewed the VCS PD as a basis for verification preparations.

First Environment also performed a strategic analysis to understand the activities and complexity of the project and to determine the nature and extent of the verification activities required. The strategic analysis was also used to develop sufficient understanding of the GHG-related activity and its relevant sector information to plan and conduct the verification.

2.1.4 Audit Kick-off

The verification audit was initiated with a kick-off conference call on October 28, 2022 between First Environment and the 3Degrees team. The communication focused on confirming the verification scope, objectives, criteria, schedule, and the data required for the verification.

2.1.5 Development of the Verification and Evidence-Gathering Plans

The Audit Team formally documented the verification plan as well as determined the evidence gathering plan. The verification plan was informed by the kick-off meeting where key elements of the verification scope were discussed including project team members, project level of assurance, materiality threshold, and standards of reporting and evaluation. It also provided an outline of the verification processes and established project deliverables. 3Degrees was afforded the opportunity to comment on the key elements of the plan for verification. A separate evidence gathering plan was designed to review all project elements in areas of potentially high risk of inaccuracy or non-conformance.

2.1.6 Execution of Evidence Gathering Activities

The Audit Team executed the evidence-gathering activities. The verification was conducted according to the verification plan and the evidence-gathering activities according to the evidence-gathering plan.

2.1.7 Site Visit

None of the conditions specified in Section 4.1.12 of the VCS Standard mandated the need for a site visit during the current verification process.

First Environment performed a site visit on December 8, 2021 as part of a previous verification process. The previous site visit included interviews with relevant site personnel and project stakeholders; review of the Project's operations; data collection procedures and information management systems; as well as assessments of the Project's controls for sources of potential errors and omissions. The previous site inspection included a tour of the landfill, all destruction devices, and all associated ancillary equipment (i.e., metering and data recording systems). First Environment confirmed during the kick-off call and through the course of verification activities that no significant changes have occurred to the Project activity since the December 8, 2021 site visit. Therefore, another site visit during the current verification process was deemed unnecessary.

2.1.8 Emissions Reduction Data and Calculation Assessment

The Audit Team performed a desktop review of the Monitoring Report, GHG emission reduction assertion, and supporting documentation, as further described in Section 2.2 below.

2.1.9 Corrective Actions and Supplemental Information

The Audit Team issued requests for supplemental information, corrective action, and clarification during the verification process. The corrective action and clarification requests and the responses provided by 3Degrees are summarized in Section 2.5.

2.1.10 Independent Review

Before verification reporting is released to the client, a First Environment lead verifier, who has not participated in the verification activities, conducts an independent review to confirm that all verification activities have been completed and provide the agreed upon level of assurance.

2.1.11 Verification Reporting and Opinion Issuance

Verification reporting, represented by this report, documents the verification processes and identifies their findings and results. Verification reporting consists of this report for 3Degrees, along with a separate Deed of Representation. Both the report and Deed of Representation are submitted to Verra as part of the verification reporting process.

The verification opinion reached is identified and discussed in Section 5 below.

2.2 Document Review

During the verification process, First Environment reviewed the Project's Monitoring Report, GHG emission reduction assertion, and supporting documentation for the current verification period to ensure consistency with the VCS Standard, ACM0001, and the VCS PD. A verification conformance checklist was developed for the Project which summarizes the criteria used to evaluate the Project, the Project's conformance with each criterion, and the Audit Team's verification findings. Discrepancies between project documentation and the verification criteria were considered material and identified for corrective action. Deviations required appropriate justification from 3Degrees. Additionally, First Environment assessed the GHG emission reduction assertion and underlying monitored data to

determine if either contained material or immaterial misstatements. The results of these reviews are discussed in greater detail below.

2.3 Interviews

Through the course of verification activities, First Environment interviewed the following project personnel via phone and electronic communications to inform the verification process:

Eden Harris – 3Degrees Group, Inc. – Project Proponent

Sofia Barker – 3Degrees Group, Inc. - Project Proponent

Andrew Whelpley – Clinton Landfill, Inc. – Landfill Manager / Owner

3Degrees personnel, were responsible for putting together the monitoring report, emission reduction calculations and participating in the verification process, including responding to all verification requests and corrective actions. Clinton Landfill personnel were responsible for implementing the monitoring plan, and providing information related to calibrations, meter maintenance, data collection and management including supporting documentation for all baseline, project emissions sources and meter and calibration documentation.

2.4 Site Visits

A site visit was not conducted as part of the current verification process for the reporting period of 01-July-2021 to 31-December-2022.

Mr. Jeff Daley performed a site visit on December 8, 2021 as part of a previous verification process. The site visit included interviews with relevant site personnel and project stakeholders; review of the Project's operations; data collection procedures and information management systems; as well as assessments of the Project's controls for sources of potential errors and omissions. The site inspection included a tour of the landfill, all destruction devices, and all associated ancillary equipment (i.e., metering and data recording systems). First Environment confirmed during the kick-off call and through the course of verification activities that no significant changes have occurred to the Project activity since the previous site visit; therefore, a repeat site visit during the current verification process was deemed unnecessary.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

The Audit Team issued eight requests for corrective action and one request for clarification during the verification process. There were no outstanding forward action requests from the validation or previous verification. 3Degree's responses were sufficient to resolve all requests. The corrective action and clarification requests and the responses provided are summarized in the tables found in Appendix A.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

There were no Forward Action Requests issued during the current verification.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

First Environment is accredited to perform validation activities as described in Section 3 below for activities in Sectoral Scope 1 (energy industries: renewable/non-renewable sources), and Sectoral Scope 13 (waste handling and disposal), which is the applicable scope for the approved methodology ACM0001.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

As described in Section 3.2 below, one new methodology deviation and four new project description deviation were validated during the current reporting period. First Environment reviewed justification for the deviations, including supporting documentation, in order to confirm that they were consistent with the underlying methodology and did not negatively impact the conservativeness or accuracy of the emission reductions. The validation process for the deviations consisted of an assessment of the Project's implementation, as described in the Monitoring Report and from discussions with 3Degrees, against the validation criteria. The validation criteria considered in the assessment of any deviations included the approved CDM methodology ACM0001, v19 and the VCS Standard.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

During the verification process, First Environment reviewed written confirmation from 3Degrees confirming that GHG emission reduction credits from the Project have not been registered under another GHG program.

First Environment concluded that the Project is eligible to participate under the VCS program.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

Section 4.1 identifies methodology deviations previously validated for the Project.

The following new methodology deviation was identified in the Monitoring Report and approved for the Project during the current verification:

Methane concentration was measured on a non-continuous basis during the reporting period. The VCS PD identifies that methane concentration is to be continuously monitored at the flare and monitored at least twice weekly at the engines via a handheld gas analyzer. CDM Tool 08; Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream allows for non-continuous methane concentration readings, but also requires at least two samples per week.

CDM Tool 08 identifies the following criteria for the use of non-continuous methane concentration data:

- The maximum waste treatment capacity of the landfill is 200 tonnes waste per day. The landfill daily waste treatment capacity is greater than 200 tonnes of waste per day. Therefore, a conservative 10 percent discount was applied to all non-continuous methane readings to account for any methane fluctuations due to the size of the landfill. The Monitoring Report provides sufficient justification and cited sources for the use of a ten percent discount all of which have been confirmed to be accurate.
- Sampling is conducted with a minimum frequency of two samples per week. The project used non-continuous methane concentration readings that were taken at a frequency which ranged from twice weekly to less than weekly throughout the reporting period. For any seven-day period in which two methane samples were taken, the methane concentration from the first sample reading for the engine skid and Flare 4 are applied across consecutive days until the next methane sample reading within the seven-day period was taken. A data analysis has been performed and provided which concluded that the approach of applying methane readings consecutively until the next reading is taken in a seven-day period is conservative when compared to an approach of averaging all methane readings taken within a seven day period. First Environment reviewed this analysis to confirm that the approach being implemented is in fact conservative.

An additional data analysis was performed to support the use of a ten percent discount. This analysis compared the use of a ten percent discount relative to the adherence to a 95/10 confidence/precision level as referenced in AMS-III.G.v10 / the Standard for Sampling and Survey of CDM Activities. First Environment reviewed this analysis which confirmed that the application of a ten percent discount to all non-continuous methane samples is below a 95-precision level. This demonstrated that the methane variation is not likely to exceed ten percent in either direction and thus justified the application of a ten percent discount as a reasonably conservative approach (i.e. the methane concentration after the application of a ten percent discount is less than the precision level of 95 percent, and therefore results in lower emission reductions). It should also be noted that no emission reductions are being claimed during any seven-day period(s) with one or fewer methane readings were taken.

- National protocols for measuring methane content of biogas by a semi-continuous analysis shall be followed. Methane sampling is carried out in accordance with manufacturer recommended procedures and adhere to the landfill's standard operating procedures which document the procedures to be followed for methane sampling.

- The biogas flow rate is monitored continuously. The methane content measured by sampling for a given period can be used directly only if the average flow rate during the following week does not fluctuate by more than +/- 20% as compared to the mean value of the flow rates for the period during which the methane content is measured by sampling. The biogas flow rate was monitored continuously during the period in which non-continuous methane concentration is applied. Additionally, a flow analysis was conducted which demonstrated that the biogas flow did not fluctuate more than +/-20% during the period when non-continuous methane is applied.

First Environment approved this deviation because it meets the criteria for permitted methodology deviations. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for measurement and monitoring. As described above, this deviation results in a comparatively accurate and conservative representation of methane concentration by following the procedures in CDM Tool08 and applying an additional 10 percent discount to measured methane samples.

The use of a 10 percent discount for methane concentration sampling is best practice and has been established by other reputable protocols and CDM Methodologies. First Environment confirmed that in the deviation description sources cited, a ten percent discount is in fact an appropriate discount to be applied to instances of non-continuous methane readings.

Additionally, Table 2 in Section 4.1 below identifies the dates of manufacturer calibration for all the portable analyzers used. Which demonstrates the analyzers were calibrated by the manufacturer to ensure their accuracy. This represents a temporary method for methane concentration measurement as the continuous analyzer was reinstalled in April 2023 at the flare, and the facility plans to install a continuous analyzer for the engines. The methodology deviation described above did not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, and the Project remained in conformance with all other ACM0001 and VCS requirements.

3.3 Project Description Deviations

The following new project description deviations are proposed in the Monitoring Report for the current reporting period:

- Methane readings taken at Flare 4: The VCS PD identifies that methane concentration readings taken at Flare 4 are measured with a continuous gas analyzer. During the current reporting period, methane concentration was taken with a portable methane analyzer on a non-continuous basis. All methane concentration readings included an additional 10 percent discount and were applied until the next measurement was taken for week in which there were two or more samples. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for measurement and monitoring. First Environment approved this deviation because the use of methane concentration readings measured by a portable analyzer with the application of a conservative discount factor is best practice and results in a conservative level of accuracy of the emission reduction calculations. Review of methane concentrations throughout the reporting period coupled with the addition of a ten percent discount provided reasonable assurance that this deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the emission reduction assertion.

- Flare thermocouple readings: The VCS PD identifies that the flare is operational when the thermocouple temperature is at or above 500F. The thermocouple at Flare 4 is placed slightly farther away from the area of combustion than the prior flares used in the Project. For the current reporting period, a temperature threshold of 212°F was applied to determine flare operability. This temperature is also consistent with the flare manufacturer specifications which state that the flare is considered operational with the low temperature setpoint of 200F is exceeded. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for applying measurement and monitored data. First Environment approved this deviation because it is reasonable to conclude landfill gas methane destruction is occurring when the temperature is above 212°F indicating the presence of a flame. Review of flare temperature data throughout the reporting period confirmed that the Project Developer is correctly excluding flow data with associated flare temperature measurements that are below 212°F. Through review of the associated flare temperature data, it was confirmed that this deviation does not negatively impact the conservativeness of the emission reduction assertion.
- Portable gas analyzer calibrations: Two of the portable gas analyzers (s/n1003016 and 1905215B) were used to take methane concentration readings when the analyzers were outside of the annual calibration frequency specified in the VCS PD. Analyzer 1003016 was used four times in December 2022 when it was past due for calibration. However, calibrations prior to use were documented for all samples which indicated analyzer 1003016 was operating accurately. Analyzer 1905215B was used for a total of twenty-one times in October and November 2022 when it was past due for calibration. There was no documented evidence of calibrations prior to use for analyzer 1905215B. However, it was demonstrated that field calibration prior to use is standard operating procedure prior to using the portable analyzers. Therefore, while not properly documented, it was demonstrated to a reasonable degree that the analyzers were properly maintained and operated accurately during the reporting period. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for measurement and monitoring. Both meters were subsequently calibrated by the manufacturer and were documented to be operating accurately. Meter s/n 1003016 was calibrated on August 8, 2023 and meter 1905215B was calibrated on October 6, 2023. Calibration reports including as found reports were provided and reviewed by First Environment to confirm that the meters were operating accurately. As a conservative measure, the project proponent applies an additional 2 percent discount to methane readings taken by each of these portable analyzers when they were used outside of the annual calibration frequency. The two percent discount is sourced from the Elkins Envision manufacturer specifications for guaranteed meter accuracy. Another words, the manufacturer guarantees accuracy to within a tolerance of 2%. Because each analyzers subsequent calibration indicated the analyzers were already operating accurately, the application of this 2% discount provides additional assurance that the methane concentration readings are conservative. First Environment approved this deviation because there was no evidence to suggest that the readings were not accurate “as is”. Additionally, First Environment reviewed documentation from the manufacturer to confirm that the Elkins Envision analyzers have an accuracy tolerance of 2% and confirmed that the emission reduction calculations were adjusted to account for this additional and conservative two percent discount.

- Portable gas analyzer calibrations prior to each use: The VCS PD identifies that documentation of a field calibration for portable gas analyzers will be available for each methane concentration measurement. There were a limited number of field calibrations prior to use that were properly documented during the reporting period. The landfill manager attested to, and provided evidence of, the landfill's standard operating procedures which identified that the procedure is to calibrate the unit(s) prior to each use. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for measurement and monitoring. First Environment approved this deviation because a reasonable level of evidence was provided to demonstrate that while not properly documented, the analyzer(s) were field calibrated prior to use. Additionally, the manufacturer calibration records for the analyzers did not identify anything that would suggest the analyzers were not functioning properly, and as discussed above, a 10 percent discount was applied to all non-continuous methane readings which ensures conservativeness.
- Quantification of methane flow on a dry basis. The Project Description identifies that methane flow is quantified in accordance with CDM Tool 08 Option C (wet basis). However, the Project Proponent determined that Option A (Volume Flow – dry basis) is more representative of the landfill methane gas flow. Under this option the volumetric fraction of methane can be either wet or dry as denoted by CDM Tool 08 / Table 2. The Tool gives the user the option to apply paragraph 23(a) (measurement of moisture content) or apply paragraph 23(b) (measurement of the gaseous stream temperature). In order to consider the volume flow to be dry, the project proponent chose to apply paragraph 23(b) of the Tool which states that the temperature of the gaseous stream must be less than 60°C (140°F). The Project Proponent provided raw data which includes gas inlet temperature readings (for both flare flow and engine flow) recorded continuously throughout the monitoring period. These readings demonstrate the gaseous stream temperature was below this threshold throughout the monitoring period and thus can be considered “dry” as per the requirements of the CDM Tool 08. First Environment reviewed all inlet temperature readings to confirm that all reading recorded were below the 60°C threshold. Additionally, this deviation does not result in any quantification changes as per CDM Tool 08 Option C and Option A utilize the same equation. This deviation is not related to and does not impact any of the ACM0001 Methodology Section 2.2 applicability conditions, or Section 5 baseline and additionality conditions and selections. This deviation, however, is related to the procedures for measurement and monitoring. First Environment approved this deviation because it represents an improvement in the description found in the validated VCS PD and improves the accuracy of the calculations by aligning more closely with the requirements of CDM Tool 08.

The project deviations described above did not impact the applicability of the methodology, additionality, or the appropriateness of the baseline scenario, and the Project remained in conformance with all other ACM0001 and VCS requirements. In addition, 3Degrees provided appropriate descriptions and justifications for the deviation. The project deviations were deemed to be valid.

3.4 Grouped Project

Not Applicable – the project is not a grouped project.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Implementation Status

The Project is implemented according to the description provided in the VCS PD, except where noted in Section 3 above, and relative to previously validated deviations identified below. The Project became operational on January 24, 2007. The Project is within its second 10-year crediting period which began on July 1, 2019 and ends on June 30, 2029. First Environment previously confirmed the Project's start date during the initial validation. Emission reductions are claimed for LFG destroyed on-site in two engine generator sets and in an open flare (Flare #4). Additionally, collection and destruction of landfill gas occurred in a pre-existing open flare prior to the Project's start date. As a result, methane destroyed in the pre-existing gas collection system is accounted for in the emission reduction assertion consistent with the VCS PD.

No data and/or variables presented in the Monitoring Report differ from those stated in the VCS PD, except where noted in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 above or as described below. Similarly, the data collection and recordkeeping procedures were found to be consistent with those outlined in the monitoring plan described by the VCS PD and meet the requirements of ACM0001.

The Project has adequate management and operational systems in place with respect to monitoring and reporting, as determined through observation during the site visit and the desktop review of project documentation. The monitoring plan was found to be suitable and implemented sufficiently for the Project activity. No material misstatements between the actual monitoring system and the monitoring plan as set out in the PD were identified, except where noted in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 above.

Similarly, the data collection and recordkeeping procedures were found to be consistent with those outlined in the monitoring plan described by the VCS PD and meet the requirements of ACM0001. The Project has adequate management and operational systems in place with respect to monitoring and reporting, as determined through previous observation during the site visit, interviews with Project personnel during the current reporting period, and the desktop review of project documentation.

During the verification process, First Environment reviewed written confirmation from 3Degrees confirming that GHG emission reduction credits for the current reporting period have not been registered under another GHG program.

The Project is not in a supply chain where GHG emissions issued are associated with goods, services, or Scope 3 emissions.

The audit history table found in Section 1.1 of the Monitoring Report was reviewed by First Environment and found to accurately reflect the Projects audit history.

The Project contributes to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), as identified in Section 1.11 of the Monitoring Report. First Environment found that the SDG contributions described in the Monitoring Report have been implemented by the Project. This was confirmed through review of emission reduction calculations, and energy production data, and landfill gas flow data. The Project activity contributes to the following SDG's:

- SDG 3.9 – Reduction in household and ambient air pollution

The Project contributes to reduced air pollution by collecting landfill gas from the landfill which would have otherwise been released to the atmosphere. The process of installing an active gas collection and control system reduces overall pollution, and methane emissions that would be caused by the landfill. The Monitoring Report provides further details and justifications for the contributions over the Project lifetime.

- SDG 7.2 – Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption

The Project contributes to the overall renewable energy share by producing electricity that is fueled from a renewable source (i.e., landfill gas methane) which then displaces fossil grid electricity production and subsequent consumption. The Monitoring Report provides further details and justifications for the contributions over the Project lifetime.

- SDG 13.0 – Climate Action

The Project contributes to this indicator by avoiding methane emissions from the landfill. These actions result in a net reduction of CO2 equivalent emissions. The Monitoring Report provides further details and justifications for the contributions over the Project lifetime.

The Project activity does not claim emission reduction credits for the displacement of fossil generated electricity. Therefore, no double counting of environmental attributes associated with electricity production and carbon credits has occurred.

The following topics were discussed with project personnel during the previous site visit and during ongoing interviews during the current reporting period:

- the data collection process used to generate reports, and
- internal documents and protocols that set guidelines for the data collection process.

The information gathered during these discussions and review was used to assess the Project's data management systems and its controls for sources of potential errors and omissions. The primary aspects of the Project's monitoring plan are described below.

The quantity of LFG sent to the flare is continuously measured using a Sage flow meter and recorded every minute. A rental Sage flow meter was used during the reporting period to facilitate calibration of the primary flow meter. The quantity of LFG sent to the engines is continuously measured using a Rosemount Transmitter on the gas header line leading to the engines and recorded every two minutes. All flow data are recorded by the Project's Yokogawa data loggers.

The methane concentration of the landfill gas was measured non-continuously by one of seven Elkins Earthworks Envision portable gas analyzers, and one Landtec GEM5000 analyzer. Methane concentration data are recorded as measured by the portable analyzers unit memory.

The flow meters and portable analyzers were calibrated in accordance with the requirements of the VCS PD except where noted in Section 3.3 above. Table 1 and Table 2 below identifies the dates each meter was calibrated:

TABLE 1: Flow Meter QAQC

Meter	Location	Dates of Use	Calibration Date(s)	VCS PD calibration frequency
Rosemount (s/n: 514151)	Engines	Entire reporting period	2/23/2021	5 Years
Sage (s/n: 214832-104765)	Flare #4	7/1/2021 - 8/17/2022; 11/29/2022 - 12/31/2022	3/10/2021; 8/25/2022	Annual
Sage (s/n: 229094-139064) - Rental	Flare #4	8/17/2022 - 11/29/2022	7/12/2022	Annual

TABLE 2: Gas Analyzer QAQC

Meter	Location	Calibration Date(s)	VCS PD calibration frequency
Elkins Earthworks Envision100 (s/n: 1003016)	Engines & Flare#4	1/8/2023; 8/4/2023	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision100 (s/n: 1403200b)	Engines & Flare#4	1/5/2022; 1/17/2023	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision100 (s/n: 2204200B)	Engines & Flare#4	8/8/2022	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision200 (s/n: 1905215B)	Engines & Flare#4	10/13/2021; 12/6/2022; 10/6/2023	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision200 (s/n: 2007201B)	Engines & Flare#4	8/30/2021; 3/14/2022; 3/15/2023	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision200 (s/n: 2106201B)	Engines & Flare#4	9/3/2021; 3/29/2022; 2/3/2023	Annual
Elkins Earthworks Envision200 (s/n: 2202205B)	Engines & Flare#4	3/8/2022; 3/2/2023	Annual
Landtec GEM5000 (G500309)	Engines & Flare#4	4/13/2021	Annual

First Environment reviewed the calibration records for all meters identified in Table 1 and Table 2 to confirm that each meter was operating within the five percent accuracy threshold established by the Standard.

Project emissions from the consumption of grid electricity is determined using utility invoices from the electricity supplier. The quantity of propane combusted is also determined based on supplier's invoices. All propane is accounted for at the time of purchase. There were no propane purchases in 2021. In 2022, 45 gallons of propane were purchased and accounted for in the calculation of project emissions.

The operation hours and electricity production data for the engines are monitored and reviewed to ensure that methane is only flowing to the engines when they are operating. The operation of the flare was monitored through the flare's thermocouple temperature readings.

The following methodology deviations were previously validated for the Project during the Project's validation:

- The default flare efficiency of the open flares was assigned a value of 96 percent as opposed to the 50 percent default efficiency for open flare as found in the CDM Tool "Project emissions from flaring" Version 3.0. First Environment confirmed that this previously validated deviation was implemented during the verification period in accordance with the validated VCS PD.
- Grid emission factor: the Project utilizes a regional default value based on U.S. EPA's eGrid database for the SRMW subregion in lieu of the default value of 1.3 tCO₂/MWh indicated

by the “Tool to calculation baseline, project, and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption.” First Environment confirmed that this previously validated deviation was implemented during the verification period in accordance with the validated VCS PD.

- Fossil fuel emission coefficients are based on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. First Environment confirmed that this previously validated deviation was implemented during the verification period in accordance with the validated VCS PD.
- Standard reference temperature: Rather than use the standard temperature of 32 °F as prescribed by the methodology and the Tool to determine the mass flow of a greenhouse gas in a gaseous stream, the Project elects to use 68 °F as a standard reference temperature as this is more common for U.S.-based landfill Project types and is consistent with industry standards. First Environment confirmed that this previously validated deviation was implemented during the verification period in accordance with the validated VCS PD.

The data collection and recordkeeping procedures were found to be consistent with those outlined in the monitoring plan described by the VCS PD and meet the requirements of the ACM0001. There were no remaining issues or material discrepancies from the previous validation or verification processes.

The Project has not received or sought another form of environmental credit, nor has it become eligible to do so since the validation. Additionally, the Project boundary has been drawn to exclude environmental attributes from renewable energy generation. First Environment confirmed through an attestation provided by 3Degrees that the Project has not participated in any other GHG program.

Overall, the Project is implemented according to the description provided in the VCS PD (except where deviations are noted above) and the monitoring system implemented was found appropriate to the task of obtaining, recording, compiling, and analyzing the monitored data and parameters.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

The Project creates no negative environmental or socio-economic impacts. The Project activity takes place on privately owned land and therefore does not impose any human-induced risks to stakeholder’s well-being, or to marginalized groups in the local community.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

The Project operates in accordance with several permits to ensure protection of the environment. No concerns from local stakeholder have been brought forth during this reporting period, or since the Project’s validation.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

Not applicable – This is not an AFOLU Project.

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction and Removal Calculations

Emission reductions are calculated ex-post using the approach indicated in ACM0001 and the VCS PD. First Environment reviewed the emission reduction calculations for the verification period to ensure accuracy in the formulas applied and the raw data and default factors used as inputs. First Environment’s review assessed whether emission reductions were free of material misstatement. The formulas were tested and found to be consistent with the calculations described in ACM0001 and the VCS PD.

Landfill gas flow sent to the flare and engines ($V_{t,wb}$) is measured continuously, and the methane fraction of the landfill gas ($VCH_{4,t,wb}$) was measured by portable gas analyzers and are used to calculate the total amount of methane destroyed by the Project ($FCH_{4,PJ,y}$).

Landfill gas combusted by the flare is measured continuously, and the methane fraction of the landfill gas measured by the portable gas analyzers are used to calculate the total amount of methane destroyed by the flare ($FCH_{4,flare,y}$). The total monthly quantity of landfill gas is determined by taking the continuous flow readings and summing them over the reporting period. The flare flow meter automatically correct flow data to standard conditions of 60°F and 14.70 psi. Flow data was then converted to standard temperature conditions of 68°F for consistency with the methane density of 0.04162 Lb. CH₄/ft³ CH₄ and is multiplied by total methane flow to convert the methane destroyed from a volumetric flow to a mass flow. A thermocouple measures flare temperature to ensure methane destruction. Any flow data with associated flare temperatures below 212°F are excluded from emission reduction calculations.

Landfill gas combusted by the engines is measured continuously, and the methane fraction of the landfill gas measured by the portable gas analyzers are used to calculate the total amount of methane destroyed by the engine ($FCH_{4,EL,y}$). The total monthly quantities of landfill gas are determined by taking the continuous flow readings and summing them over the reporting period. The engine flow meter automatically correct flow data to standard conditions of 60°F and 14.70 psi. Flow data was then converted to standard temperature conditions of 68°F for consistency with the methane density of 0.04162 Lb. CH₄/ft³ CH₄ and is multiplied by total methane flow to convert the methane destroyed from a volumetric flow to a mass flow.

Project emissions from uncombusted methane ($PE_{flare,y}$) during flaring, fossil fuel usage ($PE_{FC,y}$), and grid purchased electricity consumption ($PE_{EC,y}$) are deducted from the overall emission reductions created by the Project. Project emissions from uncombusted methane are calculated in accordance with the VCS PD. Project emissions from fossil fuel usage are quantified by multiplying the activity data by the appropriate emission factor. Project emissions from electricity consumption are quantified by multiplying the activity data by the appropriate emission factor and transmission and distribution loss factor.

Because landfill gas was collected and destroyed prior to the project activity, this amount of methane destroyed is ($FCH_{4,BL,y}$) subtracted from baseline emissions in accordance with the VCS PD. The verification process focused on the evaluation of quantification spreadsheets to ensure that they were consistent with the formulas and equations described in ACM0001 and the VCS PD. Copies of the raw data used in the calculations, including flow and methane concentration data and utility and other fossil fuel invoices, were compared with the values used in the final calculations and tested for transcription or mathematical errors. The calculations for the entire period were reviewed as well to determine whether they were free of material misstatement.

All calculation methods and emission factors used to determine emission reductions were found to be appropriate for the project type and consistent with those outlined in the validated VCS PD. The Audit Team performed an independent recalculation of the emission reductions from the verification period using the available raw data. Material misstatements were identified for correction by 3Degrees Group, Inc. as described in Section 2.5.

No material misstatements were observed in the final GHG assertion.

Overall, the GHG emission reductions were quantified correctly in accordance with the VCS PD and the ACM0001 methodology.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions and Removals

3Degrees provided adequate documentation for the emission reduction calculations as well as its management systems around the data collection process. Specifically, First Environment was provided a Monitoring Report prepared in accordance with the VCS program template, transparent calculation spreadsheets, calibration records, and data records associated with landfill gas flow, methane concentration, and electricity consumption.

The nature of all data records provided was documented objective evidence, which is a reliable data format for the determination of GHG emission reductions. A listing of final documents provided can be found in Appendix B.

Data was reviewed beginning from its original source of generation to confirm the accuracy of the information flow. Through raw data records review and knowledge of the projects data management systems, First Environment determined that the reliability of the evidence was sufficient for the determination of GHG emission reductions. The information flow from raw data output and recording to summary aggregation was verified and confirmed to be accurately represented in the final version of the Monitoring Report. The VCS PD adequately specifies appropriate calibration frequencies for all relevant monitoring equipment.

The evidence provided was consistent with the requirements of ACM0001 and the validated VCS PD and meets generally accepted evidentiary standards for best practice in GHG accounting.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

Not applicable.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

First Environment was retained to provide verification services for the Clinton Landfill Gas Collection and Combustion Project's GHG emission reductions assertion based on the following fundamentals:

- *Level of assurance:* Reasonable assurance.
- *ISO Standard 14064-03:* Specification with guidance for the verification and validation of greenhouse gas statements, 2019
- *GHG Statement Responsible Party:* 3Degrees Group, Inc.
- *Objectives of verification:* To assure project conformance with the VCS Standard, the CDM methodology ACM0001, and the VCS PD.
- *Verification criteria:* VCS Standard, the CDM methodology ACM0001, and the VCS PD.
- *Definition of materiality:* Misstatements of greater than five percent of the GHG assertion and qualitative non-conformities with the validated VCS PD are considered material.
- Scope, including:
 - *Boundaries of the assertion:* Clinton County landfill and Wabash Valley Power Associations, Inc. facility operations;
 - The physical infrastructure, facilities, and activities within the assertion: LFG collection and destruction operations;
 - *GHG sources, sinks, and reservoirs included within the assertion:* Methane emission reductions expressed as carbon dioxide-equivalents, carbon dioxide emissions from the

operation of project equipment, methane emissions from pre-project destruction of landfill gas; methane emissions from flaring; and

- The time period for the assertion: July 1, 2021 through December 31, 2022.

Based on the assessments performed and the historical evidence collected, First Environment concludes on March 12, 2024, with a reasonable level of assurance, that the emissions reductions of the Project resulting from the capture and combustion of methane gas are

- consistent with the VCS PD of January 18, 2022;
- in conformance with the VCS Standard, the CDM methodology ACM0001 (Version 19);
- without material discrepancy; and meeting the minimum level of accuracy of at least 95 percent.

Additionally, the deviations reviewed and approved during the current audit process are consistent with the VCS Standard and ACM0001 methodology, including all validation criteria therein.

Verification period: From 1-July-2021 to 31-December-2022.

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2021 (01-July-2021 - 31-December-2021)	14,946	39	0	14,907
2022 (01-January-2022 - 31-December-2022)	77,822	94	0	77,728
Total	92,768	133	0	92,635

Ex-ante GHG emission reductions and removals estimate during validation and compared to the actual achieved emissions reductions over the current reporting period are summarized in the table below:

Year	Ex-ante emissions reductions /removals	Achieved emissions reductions /removals	Percent difference	Justification for the difference
2021 (01-July-2021 - 31-December-2021)	48,348	14,907	-69.2 %	Decrease in achieved emission reductions is due to the lack of continuous methane sampling. This resulted in less emission reductions that could be generated due to missing methane concentration data and the application of a conservative 10 percent discount to all available methane concentration readings.
2022 (01-January-2022 - 31-December-2022)	99,888	77,728	-22.2 %	Decrease in achieved emission reductions is due to the lack of continuous methane sampling. This resulted in less emission reductions

<i>Year</i>	<i>Ex-ante emissions reductions /removals</i>	<i>Achieved emissions reductions /removals</i>	<i>Percent difference</i>	<i>Justification for the difference</i>
				that could be generated due to missing methane concentration data, and calibration frequency exceedances. These factors resulted in the application of a conservative 12 percent overall discount to all available methane concentration readings.
Total	148,236	92,955	-37.3 %	N/A

APPENDIX A: Resolution of Findings

ID	Corrective Action Request	Participant Response	Verification Conclusion
1	Monitoring Report, Section 3.2.1 (Methodology Deviations) - Data substitution deviation issues: - The data substitution deviation does not specify which flow data (i.e., flare or engine) is being substituted for. - The deviation description states that methane readings were taken and recorded at the engine skid on September 2, 2021 and September 7, 2021. However, there were no methane readings recorded at the engine skid on these dates. - The deviation description does not identify and justify how the deviation meets the requirements of CDM Tool 08 / Appendix A, paragraphs 2, 3(b), 3(c), and Table 1 substitution methods.	The data substitution deviation was removed from the Monitoring Report. This is because there were no methane samples taken during the potential substitute period, and therefore flow data cannot be substituted. As a result, there is no emission reductions being claimed during the data gap.	Response is acceptable.
2	Monitoring Report Section 3.2.1 - The methane sample frequency is incorrectly identified as a methodology deviation.	The Methane Sample frequency deviation remains in Section 3.2.1 as a methodology deviation. Methane sampling is essentially both a project description deviation and also a methodology deviation; due to the frequency of sampling and the addition of a conservative 10 percent discount factor applied to non-continuous methane readings due to not meeting all CDM Tool 08 / Appendix A requirements. The deviation descriptions related to methane sampling have been revised for clarity and to add additional justifications.	Response is acceptable.
3	Monitoring Report Section 3.2.2 - Methane sample readings deviation: The deviation does not identify and justify how the deviation meets all of the requirements of CDM Tool 08 / Appendix A, paragraphs 7(a) through (d)	The methane sample frequency deviation has been revised to identify each of the CDM Tool 08 / Appendix A requirements and justify how the Project meets each.	Response is acceptable. See Section 3.2 above for a detailed assessment of the participants response.
4	Monitoring Report, Section 3.2.2 - Flare thermocouple deviation does not identify/justify if the alternate operating temperature threshold is consistent with manufacturer specifications as specified in ACM0001,v19 - Data/Parameter table 12 (measurement procedure (a)).	The Monitoring Report was revised to further justify the use of a 212F flare temperature threshold. Documentation from the flare manufacturer was provided that identifies the low temperature cut-off which initiates flare shutdown is typically set at 200F. Therefore, a 212F temperature threshold to confirm flare operability ensures that the temperature is far above ambient temperature and even above the low temperature cut-off to ensure methane destruction.	Response is acceptable.

ID	Corrective Action Request	Participant Response	Verification Conclusion
5	The Section 1 Table (Audit History) of the Monitoring Report does not identify the crediting period renewal validation.	The audit history table has been revised to identify the crediting period renewal validation.	Response is acceptable.
6	The emission reduction calculations do not account for any flow to the engine(s) on December 31, 2022, when valid data exists.	The emissions reductions calculation spreadsheet has been updated to include flow data to the engine(s) on December 31, 2022.	Response is acceptable.
7	Calibration documentation has not been provided for the Flare #4 Sage flow meter, and the methane analyzer(s) used throughout the reporting period.	Calibration documentation for the Sage meter used at Flare #4; and the methane analysers has been provided. Additionally, evidence of a field calibration prior to use for all methane readings is not available. Therefore, a project description deviation has been added to Section 3.2.2 of the Monitoring Report to address this issue.	Response is acceptable.
8	The Sage flow meter (s/n: 214832-104765) located at Flare #4 was not maintained and calibrated according to manufacturer specifications (i.e., annual in-situ verification).	Documentation from the Sage manufacturer has been provided to confirm that the 12 month calibration interval is not a hard requirement, and the frequency should be determined by the customers processes and procedures. The site performs factory calibrations once every calendar year but may not be spaced exactly twelve months apart. The Sage flow meter was calibrated once during each calendar year of the 2021-2022 reporting period	Response is acceptable.

ID	Clarification Request	Participant Response	Verification Conclusion
1	Please clarify why the February 22, 2022 methane reading of 55.8% for the energy plant is not being applied in the emission reduction calculations.	This reading was accidentally left out of the quantification. The emissions reductions calculation spreadsheet was updated to include the methane measurement made at the engines on February 22, 2022.	Response is acceptable.

APPENDIX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Final Versions of Documents Provided
Calculations
1 - Clinton Emissions Reductions 2021-2022 v7.xlsx
Data
2021-12 Ameren Illinois Invoice (10-31-21 - 11-30-21).pdf
2022-01 Ameren Illinois Invoice (11-30-21 - 12-31-21).pdf
2021-09 Ameren Illinois Invoice (7-23-21 - 8-31-21).pdf
2023-01 Ameren Illinois Invoice (11-30-22 - 12-31-22).pdf
2022-07 Ameren Illinois Invoice (5-31-22 - 6-30-22).pdf
2021-10 Ameren Illinois Invoice (8-31-21 - 9-30-21).pdf
2022-10 Ameren Illinois Invoice (8-31-22 - 9-30-22).pdf
2022-11 Ameren Illinois Invoice (9-30-22 - 10-31-11).pdf
2021-11 Ameren Illinois Invoice (9-30-21 - 10-31-21).pdf
2022-04 Ameren Illinois Invoice (2-28-22 - 3-31-22).pdf
2022-12 Ameren Illinois Invoice (10-31-22 - 11-30-22).pdf
2021-08 Ameren Illinois Invoice (6-25-21 - 7-23-21).pdf
2022-05 Ameren Illinois Invoice (3-31-22 - 4-30-22).pdf
2022-09 Ameren Illinois Invoice (7-28-22 - 8-31-22).pdf
2022-02 Ameren Illinois Invoice (12-31-21 - 1-31-22).pdf
2022-08 Ameren Illinois Invoice (6-30-22 - 7-28-22).pdf
2022-06 Ameren Illinois Invoice (4-30-22 - 5-31-22).pdf
2021-07 Ameren Illinois Invoice (5-31-21 - 6-25-21).pdf
2022-03 Ameren Illinois Invoice (1-31-22 - 2-28-22).pdf
Flare4_2021-2022.xlsx
Gas Skid_2021-2022.xlsx
Clinton Methane Generation Calculator.xlsx
12 -Clinton Landfill Hourly Date JUNE 2022.xlsx
01- Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_July 2021.xlsx
14-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date AUGUST 2022.xlsx
11-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_May 2022.xlsx
LFGTE Daily Log thru 10.31.22.xlsx
18-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date DECEMBER 2022.xlsx
09-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_March 2022.xlsx
05-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_November 2021.xlsx
15-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date SEPTEMBER 2022.xlsx
13-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date JULY 2022.xlsx
03- Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_September 2021.xlsx
17-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date NOVEMBER 2022.xlsx
04-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_October 2021.xlsx

10-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_April 2022.xlsx
06-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_REVISED_December 2021.xlsx
08-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_February 2022.xlsx
02- Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_August 2021.xlsx
07-Illinois Power Marketing Invoice_January 2022.xlsx
16-Clinton Landfill Hourly Date OCTOBER 2022.xlsx
2021-2022 Clinton Landfill Gas Methane Readings.xlsx
15- Clinton Double-counting attestation v2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Sep 2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Jul 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Mar 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Sep 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Apr 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Jul 2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - May 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\2021-2022 Fossil Fuel Usage Summary.csv
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Feb 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Oct 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Jun 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Oct 2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Dec 2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Aug 2021.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Dec 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Aug 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Nov 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Jan 2022.pdf
8 - Flare 4 Fossil Fuel Invoices\C&I Power - Nov 2021.pdf
Clinton Landfill 3_01-20-2022 processed.xlsx
Clinton Landfill 3_02-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-31-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-30-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-10-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-18-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_04-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_04-06-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-14-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-22-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-03-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-09-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-24-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_01-20-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_20-01-2022 (2).csv
ClintonProbes_20-01-2022.xlsx
Clinton Landfill 3_03-07-2022.csv

Clinton Landfill 3_04-13-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_01-31-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-21-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-22-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-14-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-15-2022.csv
Clinton_30-09-2022.csv
Clinton_29-09-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_21-09-2022.csv
Clinton_09-2022dc1.csv
Clinton_01-09-2022.csv
Clinton_06-09-2022.csv
Clinton_09-2022jj.csv
Clinton_21-09-2022.csv
Clinton_09-09-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_09-2022 PROBES.csv
Clinton_22-09-2022.csv
Clinton_19-09-2022.csv
Clinton_22-11-2022.csv
Clinton_15-11-2022.csv
Clinton_16-11-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_10-11-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 1_09-11-2022.csv
Clinton_29-11-2022.csv
Clinton_30-11-2022.csv
Clinton_1 2 8 9 11-2022.csv
Clinton_08-12-2022.csv
Clinton_15-12-2022a.csv
Clinton_29-12-2022.csv
Clinton_07-12-2022.csv
Clinton_20-12-2022.csv
Clinton_15-12-2022.csv
Clinton_19-12-2022.csv
Clinton_13-12-2022.csv
Clinton_28-12-2022.csv
Clinton_15-06-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_07-06-2022.csv
Clinton_16-06-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_01-06-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 1_28-06-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_06-2022.csv
Clinton_17-06-2022.csv
Clinton_10-2022 DC.csv
Clinton_10-2022.csv
Clinton_28-10-2022.csv

ClintonProbes_10-2022.csv
Clinton_19-10-2022DC.csv
Clinton_20-10-2022 JJ.csv
Clinton_03-2022.csv
Clinton_03-2022 Probes_AAIR.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_21-04-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_28-04-2022.csv
Clinton_20-04-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_27-04-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 1_04-06-2022.csv
Clinton_19-04-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_20-04-2022.csv
Clinton_19-04-2022.enc
Clinton Landfill 3_14-04-2022.csv
Clinton_21-04-2022.csv
ClintonProbes_20-01-2022.csv
Clinton_19-20-01-2022.csv
Clinton_18-01-2022.csv
Clinton_12-06-2021 AS.xlsx
Clinton_12-02-2021 JJ.csv
Clinton_12-06-2021 AS.csv
Clinton_12-02-2021 JJ.xlsx
Clinton_12-02-2021 AS.csv
Clinton_12-02-2021 AS.xlsx
Clinton_11-2021.csv
Clinton_18-08-2022jb.csv
Clinton_17-08-2022.csv
Clinton_25-08-2022.csv
Clinton_26-08-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_03-08-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_04-08-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_08-08-2022.csv
Clinton_31-08-2022.csv
Clinton_18-08-2022dc.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_02-08-2022.csv
Clinton_19-08-2022.csv
Clinton_18-05-2022.csv
Clinton_17-05-2022.csv
Clinton_19-05-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 05-2022 DC.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_25-05-2022.csv
PCC3_25-05-2022.csv
Clinton Probes 2-15-2022.csv
Clinton_02-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_12-07-2022.csv

Clinton Landfill 3_07-07-2022.csv
Clinton_21-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_26-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_28-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 19-07-2022a.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_13-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_27-07-2022.csv
Clinton_25-07-2022.csv
Clinton_20-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 1_27-07-2022.csv
Clinton Landfill 3_05-07-2022.csv
1 - Compiled Raw Data 09.10.21-12.07.21.xlsx
2 - Compiled Raw Data 1.12.22-6.30.22 .xlsx
3 - Compiled Raw Data 7.01.22-11.30.22.xlsx
Touchscreen backup flare4.xlsx
GTE Gas Skid\2022.12.01-2023.01.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.07.05-2022.08.04.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.10.01-2022.11.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2021.11.09-2021.12.08.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.08.01-2022.09.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.05.02-2022.06.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.03.01-2022.04.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2021.07.01-2021.08.30.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2021.12.08-2022.01.03.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.04.01-2022.05.02.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2021.10.04-2021.11.09.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.02.08-2022.03.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.09.01-2022.10.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2021.09.09-2021.10.04.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.11.01-2022.12.01.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.01.03-2022.02.08.xls
GTE Gas Skid\2022.06.01-2022.07.05.xls
5 - Engine run log thru 1-31-23.xlsx
Monitoring
Envision 1403200B 011723.pdf
Envision 2202205B 030223.pdf
Envision 2106201B 020323.pdf
Envision 2007201B 031523.pdf
Envision 2106201B 090321.pdf
Envision 1905215B 120622.pdf

Envision 2007201B 083021.pdf
Envision 2106201B 032922.pdf
Envision 2204200B 080822.pdf
Envision 2007201B 031422.pdf
Envision 1905215B 101321.pdf
Envision 2202205B 030822.pdf
Envision 1403200B 010522.pdf
Envision 1003016 012023.pdf
Clinton LF Calibration Readings 120121 through 042823 (CEC Database).xlsx
Spare Sage correction factor.pdf
Temp Sage Meter 193064 Calibration.pdf
Flow meter correction factor clarification.pdf
Sage Meter User Manual.pdf
Sage Meter 104765 - 2022 Calibration.pdf
Rosemont Energy Skid Flow Meter Cal 7-20-2016.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid calibration_02-23-21.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid field service report 02-23-21.pdf
3DegreesInc Mail - Emerson Transmitter calibration.pdf
Rosemount Calibration Interval Calc.xlsx
Rosemount 3051 Reference Manual.pdf
Rosemount 3051 GasSkid1 Configuration Report.pdf
Rosemont Energy Skid Flow Meter Cal 7-20-2016.pdf
Flare 4 Sage Meter Factory Calibration_Mar 10 2021.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid calibration_02-23-21.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid field service report 02-23-21.pdf
Rosemont Energy Skid Flow Meter Cal 7-20-2016.pdf
Flare 4 Sage Meter Factory Calibration_Mar 10 2021.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid calibration_02-23-21.pdf
Rosemount Gas skid field service report 02-23-21.pdf
07- FIGURE 1 LANDFILL GAS COLLECTION & CONTROL SYSTEM AS OF NOVEMBER 2020 (911183250).pdf
08- 514813 - C3D - PDC 3 Clinton LFG Connector Header - 24X36 - 201511NOV24.pdf
09- 514813 - C3D - PDC 3 Clinton LFG Plan View - 24X36 - 201511NOV24.pdf
Clinton Monitoring Report 2021-2022 v10.pdf