

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

Date: 12-31-21 Inspector: Hy

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 19°

		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		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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 12/23/21 Inspector: Megan L.
 Time: 15:00 Weather Conditions: Sunny, 40°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?		✓	Slopes look good; no movement observed
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.	✓		Cover right away
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?		✓	No Complaints

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 12-17-21 Inspector: Heath Gandy

Time: 2:00 Weather Conditions: 22°

		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?		✓	Slopes look good
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?	✓		King Ash
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		✓	No dust complaints Received
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY

Date: 12-10-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 1:00 Weather Conditions: 35° / Snowy

		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: 12-3-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 12:30 Weather Conditions: 38°

		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: 11-26-21 Inspector: Heath
 Time: 3:00 Weather Conditions: 50'

		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: 11-19-21 Inspector: Hg
 Time: 4:00 Weather Conditions: 40° 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 11-12-21 Inspector: Heath Gray
 Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 48°

		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?		T	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 11-5-21 Inspector: By
 Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 5/0

		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	X	No Resp
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 10-29-21 Inspector: HJ
 Time: 10:45 Weather Conditions: 48°

		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	X	No KING PLANT
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 10-22-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 3:30 Weather Conditions: 60° Chilly

		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	X	NO KING PLANT
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 10-15-21 Inspector: LM
 Time: 3:00 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	X	NO KING PLANT
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 10-8-21 Inspector: Heath Gandy
 Time: 3:00 Weather Conditions: 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	Looks Good
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: 10-1-21 Inspector: Heath Gentry
 Time: 9:30 Weather Conditions: 70°

		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	X	Gen Ash cleaned up still
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: 9-24 Inspector: Heath Grant
 Time: 4:5 Weather Conditions: 60°

		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: 9-17-21 Inspector: Heath Jearley
 Time: 10:45 Weather Conditions: 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 9-10-21 Inspector: Heath
 Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: 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		NO 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 9-3-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 70°

		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: 8-26-21 Inspector: Key
 Time: 1:00 Weather Conditions: Partly

		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: 8-20-21 Inspector: Heath
 Time: 1:45 Weather Conditions: Nice 89°

		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: 8-13-21 Inspector: Heath York
 Time: 9:00 Weather Conditions: Nice

		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: 8-6-21 Inspector: Hy

Time: 11:45 Weather Conditions: Nice 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 7-30-21 Inspector: Hy
 Time: 2:00 Weather Conditions: W/ile / sunny

		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: 7-23-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 80°

		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	0	
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: 7-16-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 7-9-21 Inspector: Heath
 Time: 2:00 Weather Conditions: 77°

		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: 6-30-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 80°

		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: 6-25-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 90°

		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: 6-18-21 Inspector: Heath
 Time: 9:15 Weather Conditions: 78°

		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	DONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 6-11-21 Inspector: Heath Yearling
 Time: 2:30 pm Weather Conditions: 95° HOT

		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	DONE / NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 6-4-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 90°

		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: 5-28-21 Inspector: Heath Yearly

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: RAINY

		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: 5-21-21 Inspector: Heath Yearby
 Time: 1:15 Weather Conditions: Rainy

		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	no 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 5-14-11 Inspector: Heath Gentry
 Time: 3:30 Weather Conditions: 58

		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	NO 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 5-7-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 52°

		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	No 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 4-30-21 Inspector: Heath Yearly

Time: 1:15 Weather Conditions: 55°

		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	NO KING NO 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			
1.1.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 4-23-21 Inspector: Heath Yearly

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 48°

		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	No 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 4-16-21 Inspector: Hy

Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: 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	No 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 4-9-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: RAINY 48°

		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	X	NO 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?			
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 3-26 4-2-21 Inspector: Heath Gentry

Time: 1:15 Weather Conditions: 51°

		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	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X	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: 3-26-21 Inspector: Heath Yearling

Time: 12:10 Weather Conditions: 38

		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	NO KING ASH (3-9-21 LAST LOAD)
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 3-19-21 Inspector: Heath Gentry

Time: 1:15pm Weather Conditions: 50°

		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	NO KING ASH (3-9-21 LAST LOAD)
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?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 3-12-21 Inspector: Heath Yearberg
 Time: 10:20am Weather Conditions: 36° WINDY

		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		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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 3-5-21 Inspector: Scott Yearby

Time: 3:00 Weather Conditions: 46° nice

		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		KING
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: 2-26-21 Inspector: Heath Yearby
 Time: 10:45 Weather Conditions: WINDY 23°

		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: 2-19-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 1:30 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 2-12-21 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:15 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		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE

Additional Notes: _____

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

Date: 2-5-21 Inspector: Heath Young

Time: 1:30 Weather Conditions: 11°

		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: 1-29-21 Inspector: Hutt

Time: 11:15 Weather Conditions: 3s

		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: 1-22-21 Inspector: Heath Yeary

Time: 9:00 Weather Conditions: 21°

		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	NO 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 1-15-21 Inspector: Heath Grady
 Time: 2:00 Weather Conditions: 33°

		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	NO 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 1-8-21 Inspector: Heath Yearby
 Time: 11:40 Weather Conditions: 24°

		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	NO 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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:
