

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 12-27
 Time: 10:30
 Inspector: [Signature]
 Weather Conditions: 40°

Yes
 No
 Notes

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 12-22-15

Inspector: [Signature]

Weather Conditions: 1:30

35°

Time: 1:30

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 12-13-19

Inspector: [Signature]

Weather Conditions: 10:00 / 11°

Time: 10:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

96-0137

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Inspector: *Scott Young*

Date: 12-6-19

Weather Conditions: 34°

Time: 10:00

Notes	No	Yes
-------	----	-----

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X	
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	NO DISTRACT ENERGY NO KMS ASH
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetter) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 11-29-15

Inspector: Mark

Weather Conditions: 6" Snow

Time: 9:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 11-22-15

Inspector: [Signature]

Weather Conditions: 40°

Time: 10:45

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	None
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	None

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Inspector: Heath

Date: 11-15

Weather Conditions: 36°

Time: 11:45

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 11-8-19

Inspector: Heath Sparks
 Weather Conditions: Cool

Time: _____

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
	X	
Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		
Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	None ASH
Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	None

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 11-1-19
 Inspector: Scott Sparks
 45

Time: 2:00
 Weather Conditions:

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

None

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 10-25-19 Inspector: *Scott Gray* Weather Conditions: 60° *cool* 11:30

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 10-18-19

Inspector: Heath Sparks

Weather Conditions: 69°

Time: 11:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 10-19-19 Inspector: Keith Young
Time: 12:40 Weather Conditions: 65°

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 10-4-19

Inspector: *Keith Gentry*

Weather Conditions: 58°

Time: 2:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 9-27-19 Inspector: *David Green* 67°
Time: 1:45 Weather Conditions:

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 9-20-19 Inspector: Brett Young
Time: 11:40 Weather Conditions: 72°

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
	X	
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	KMG
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	None
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 9-13

Inspector: *Keith Gray*

Weather Conditions: 65°

Time: 8:15 AM

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 9-6-19

Inspector: Keith Jones

Weather Conditions: 70°

Time: 11:30

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

NAME

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 8-30-19
Time: 11:51

Inspector: Artt. Spang
Weather Conditions: 72

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 8-23-19

Inspector: AT# 750

Weather Conditions: 11:45

Time: 11:45

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 8-16-19

Inspector: Luke Bergmann

Time: 4:00 Weather Conditions: Sunny 80°F

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 8-9-15 Inspector: Keith Gandy Weather Conditions: 80
Time: 11:15

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X			
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X			None

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 8-27-15

Inspector: Hest

84°

Weather Conditions:

Time: 10:05

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.		Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?
2.	X	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?
3.	✓	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	X	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.
5.	X	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?
6.	X	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?
7.	X	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?
8.	X	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.
9.	X	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.
10.	X	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.
11.	X	Were the citizen complaints logged?

			None
--	--	--	------

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 7-26-19 Inspector: AH

Time: 7:10 Weather Conditions: Rainy 75°

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

ABUSE

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 7-19-19

Inspector: dy

Weather Conditions: 81°

Time: 1:35

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sidelopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	A
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 7-12

Inspector: *Beath*

Weather Conditions: 79°

Time: 10:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<i>None</i>

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 7-5-19

Inspector: AH

Weather Conditions: 85°

Time: 9:45

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
	X	
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	Klaus
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 6-28-19

Inspector: KJ

Weather Conditions: 2:30

JK

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		Krusc ASH
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		None

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
 SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 6-21-15
 Time: 3:00

Inspector: *Mark Gray*
 Weather Conditions: 65

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	X	KING ASH
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 6-14

Inspector: *Scott Young*

Weather Conditions: 72°

Time: 9:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 6-2-19

Inspector: NY

Time: 7:06 Weather Conditions: 65°

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>KING ASK</u>
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>None</u>

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 5-31-19

Inspector: AK

Weather Conditions: 59° CAC

Time: 7:00

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 5-23

Inspector: Heath

Weather Conditions: 60°

Time: 3:00

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
Yes	No	Notes	

1.		X	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?
2.		X	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?
3.		X	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4.		X	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.
5.		X	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?
6.		X	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?
7.		X	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?
8.		X	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.
9.		X	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.
10.		X	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.
11.		X	Were the citizen complaints logged?

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 5-17-15

Inspector: AD

Time: 11:30 Weather Conditions: 50°

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		Yes	No	Notes
--	--	-----	----	-------

1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X		
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 5-10-19 Inspector: *Keith Sparks* Weather Conditions: 58° 10:00

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	
Yes	No

1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KL-6 ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		NAME

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 5-3-19

Inspector: Keith Young

Weather Conditions: Clear 40°

Time: 1:00

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		Yes	No	Notes
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?		X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?		X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 4-26-19 Inspector: *Note Reentry*
 Time: 1:30 Weather Conditions: *Partly Cloudy 57F*

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	
Yes	No

1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the slopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>No Complaints</i>

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 4-19-19

Inspector: Keith Perry

Weather Conditions: Cool Clear 60°

Time: 10:00

Notes

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X	
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		X	
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?		X	
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?		X	
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.		X	
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.		X	
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	None

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 4-12-15

Inspector: LM

Weather Conditions: 11:15 Windy / cool / snow

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 4-5-19

Inspector: ASB

Weather Conditions: 16:00

SB

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 3-29

Inspector: HTH

35

Time: 3:06 Weather Conditions:

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	Fluvic ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 3-22-19

Inspector: *Keith Jenkins*

Weather Conditions: 40° *coo*

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetter) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 3-14-19

Inspector: 1/4

Weather Conditions: 4/8

Time: 11:54

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	Kind
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X	NONE

Additional Notes:

LOTS OF WATER EVERYWHERE

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 3-8-19

Inspector: AFJ

Weather Conditions: 11:00

16°
Sunny

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>King</u>
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 3-1-19

Inspector: *Artt Kelly*

Weather Conditions: 10:30 10°/50winds

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	None

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 2-22-15

Inspector: Beck

Weather Conditions: 2:30 25°

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 2/15/19

Inspector: *BT*

Time: 9:00 Weather Conditions: -10° C

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 2-8-19

Inspector: [Signature]
Weather Conditions: 11:45 - 9:00 COLD

Yes	No	Notes
-----	----	-------

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
 SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 2-1-19

Inspector: *Keith Gandy*

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 90 cals

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	✓		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	✓		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	✓		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	✓		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	✓		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	✓		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	✓		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 1-25-19 Inspector: *Scott Young* 4th
Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions:

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	✓		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	✓		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	✓		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	✓		KING ASH
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	✓		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	✓		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	✓		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	✓		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	✓		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	✓		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	✓		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 1-18-19

Inspector: *Scott Gentry*

Weather Conditions: 900 26°

Time:

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	Yes	No	Notes
--	-----	----	-------

1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	X		
2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	X		
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	X		

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING ASH
5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		NONE

Additional Notes:

**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 1-11-19 Inspector: Keith Yearling Weather Conditions: 16° Time: 11:30

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		Yes	No	Notes
--	--	-----	----	-------

1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))

4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KIN 6 ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?		X	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?		X	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 1-4-19

Inspector: Keith Young

Weather Conditions: 38°

Time: 1:40

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		Yes	No	Notes
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the slopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	

CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		Long Run
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptible to fugitive dust generation?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	X		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11.	X		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	X		None

Additional Notes: