WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| i | 5-2-18 Inspector: Start Weather Conditions: DL | 1 | | |
|-------|---|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| me: | Weather Conditions: Web | \rightarrow | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | . Yes | No | Notes |
| CR La | undfill 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 | | 1/ | l r |
| | CCR? | | 0 | ! |
| 2. | Were conditions observed within the cells | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | , _ | 4 |
| | 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. | | | |
| CR Fu | gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(| 4)) | <u> </u> | |
| 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 | | | , et |
| | suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? | | i/ | Boton sh |
| 6. | If response to question 5 is no, was CCR | | | |
| | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | | |
| | landfill working face, or was the CCR not | | | |
| | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | | |
| 7. | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | | | |
| | landfill access roads? | | ν | |
| 8. | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | | | <i>-</i> . |
| | 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, | <i>i</i> / | | |
| | 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? | | | w /N |
| | | | L | |

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| | SKB LANSIN | - | = | | A. |
|---------------|---|--------------------|--------|------------|----|
| Date: | 5-9-18 Inspector: | >_~~ | (le) | t~ | |
| | G : OTT | P / | | | |
| Time: | C. 30 Weather Conditions: Con | 27 | | | |
| | | Yes | No | Notes | |
| CCRL | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84 | : P) | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | | | - | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | | l ./ | | |
| | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | | 1 | |
| · 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 | : | 1/ | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | | |
| CCR Ft | gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(| 4)) | | | |
| 4. | Was CCR received during the reporting | | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | . / | t | | |
| | information required. | | | | |
| 5. | Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust | 1 | | 0 1 | |
| | suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? | | | parton | 18 |
| 6. | If response to question 5 is no, was CCR | | | • | • |
| | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | | | |
| | landfill working face, or was the CCR not | | | İ | |
| | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | | | |
| 7. | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | | | | |
| | landfill access roads? | | V. | | |
| 8. | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | | | <i>'</i> . | |
| | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | | | • | |
| | corrective action measures below. | | | | |
| 9. | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | |
| ļ | 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? | | | A//S | |
| - | ' | | | | |
| Addition | al Notes: | | | | |
| | | | | | |

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| | SKB LANSIN | • | - | · | |
|-----------|--|-----------|----------|---------|-----|
| Date: | Inspector: | 19/1 | | _ | |
| Time: | Weather Conditions: | 2~~ | | | |
| | · | Yes | No | Notes | |
| CCR La | ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84 | <u>4)</u> | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | l U | | |
| 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? | | 1 | | |
| 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 Fu | gitive 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. | V | · | | |
| 5. | Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? | | <i>i</i> | Botton- | der |
| 6. | If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | V | | | |
| 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? | | | NA | |
| Additions | al Notes: | . • | | | |