

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

Date: 12-30-22 Inspector: Heath York  
 Time: 11:30 Weather Conditions: 17°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 12-23-22 Inspector: H4  
 Time: 9:00 Weather Conditions: -18° cold / BLIZZARD

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	

<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	<del>X</del>	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: 12-16-22 Inspector: HJ  
 Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: 29°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

I-Audit  
10:21AM

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

Date: 12-9 Inspector: 164  
 Time: 2:00 Weather Conditions: 25°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 12-2-22 Inspector: H. Hoff  
 Time: 12:20 Weather Conditions: 34°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 11-25-22 Inspector: Ag  
 Time: 8:15 Weather Conditions: 29°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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 (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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

Additional Notes:

---



---

AUDITOR  
 Submitted @ 8:15 AM  
 11-25-22

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

Date: 11-18-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 11:30 Weather Conditions: 25°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		11-18-22 KING PLANT
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: 11-11-22 Inspector: Heith  
 Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 31°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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?			
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: 11-4-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 3:30 Weather Conditions: 60°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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?			
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:

---



---

2nd  
**WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT**  
**SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTRIAL WASTE FACILITY**

Date: 10-28-22 Inspector: HJ

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Weather Conditions: 60

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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?			}
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:

---



---

210

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

Date: 10-21-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Weather Conditions: 60'

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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	

Additional Notes:

---



---

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

Date: 10-14-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 2:15 Weather Conditions: 44°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		Kinsb
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: 10-7-22 Inspector: H4  
 Time: 3:00 Weather Conditions: 55°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 9-30-22 Inspector: ky  
 Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 65°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	No Kow6 A54
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: 9-23-20 Inspector: HJ  
 Time: 11:30 Weather Conditions: 60°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	KING <sup>NO</sup> 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: 9-16-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 1:00 Weather Conditions: 75°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 9-9-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 11:20 Weather Conditions: 65 /

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 9-2-22 Inspector: ADY

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 75°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 8-26-22 Inspector: By

Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: 81°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 8/19/2022 Inspector: Megan L.

Time: 9:30 Weather Conditions: Overcast, 70° F, light Wind

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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?	<del>✓</del>	✓	No disruptions.
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.		✓	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		✓	no complaints

Additional Notes:

---



---

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

Date: 8-12-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: COOL / RAINING

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 8-5-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 9:30 Weather Conditions: 77°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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	

Additional Notes:

---



---

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

Date: 7-29-22 Inspector: Jim

Time: 11:35 Weather Conditions: 75°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING ASA
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: 7-22-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 1:20 Weather Conditions: 80°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 7-15-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 11:00 Weather Conditions: 80°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	NONE KNOWN
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: 7-8-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 1:30 Weather Conditions: 75°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING PLANT
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: 7-1-22 Inspector: HJ  
 Time: 11:15 Weather Conditions: 80°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING PLANT
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: 6-24-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 11:20 Weather Conditions: 82°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING PLANT
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: 6-17-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 12:45 Weather Conditions: 78°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X	<del>X</del>	YES, 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: 6-10-22 Inspector: Heath

Time: 9:15 Weather Conditions: 70°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	NO ASA THIS WEEK
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: 6-3-22 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:00 Weather Conditions: Sunny 72°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	NO KING ASH THIS WK
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: 5/27 Inspector: Megan L.  
 Time: 1025 Weather Conditions: Sunny, 70°F

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	<u>NO King Ash Received</u>
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: 5-20-22 Inspector: Hath

Time: 9:35 Weather Conditions: 50° cool / rain

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING A54
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: 5-13-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 11:15 Weather Conditions: 80° NICE / MUGGY

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 5-6-20 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 8:30 Weather Conditions: 56°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 4-29-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 10:15 Weather Conditions: 40

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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?			
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: 4-23-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 11:40 Weather Conditions: 31 RAINY

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 4-15-22 Inspector: Hj

Time: 1:30pm Weather Conditions: 31c

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 4-8-22 Inspector: Heath

Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: 40°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 4-1-22 Inspector: Heath  
Time: 10:15 Weather Conditions: 38°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 3-25-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 11:40 Weather Conditions: 37°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 3-18-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 10:45 Weather Conditions: 45°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		X	DONT SHOW ANY THIS WEEK
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: 3-11-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 11:40 Weather Conditions: 110

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 3-4-22 Inspector: Hg

Time: 1:55 Weather Conditions: 30

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING A54
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	N/A NONE

Additional Notes:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Date: 2/25 Inspector: Megann C.  
 Time: 13:50 Weather Conditions: 17°F, Sunny

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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		load is dumped at toe of slope & immediately covered.
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?		N/A	no complaints logged.

Additional Notes:

---



---

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

Date: 2-18-22 Inspector: Ny

Time: 11:15 Weather Conditions: cold

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		<u>KING PLANT</u>
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	

Additional Notes:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Date: 2-11-22 Inspector: Heath  
 Time: 12:35 Weather Conditions: 22°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 2-4-22 Inspector: Heath Yealy

Time: 11:15 Weather Conditions: 6°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 1-28-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 1:15 Weather Conditions: 31

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 1-21-22 Inspector: Hy  
 Time: 10:40 Weather Conditions: 12°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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: 1-14-22 Inspector: Hg  
 Time: 10:30 Weather Conditions: Snow/cold 17°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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?			
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: 1-7-22 Inspector: Hy

Time: 1:00 Weather Conditions: 0°

		Yes	No	Notes
<b>CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)</b>				
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	
<b>CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))</b>				
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:

---



---



---