WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: 2/6/23 SHAMROCK ENVIRONMENTAL LANDFILL.

Time: #1:35p Weather Conditions: Party Cloudy 300

| CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) 1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing period? Remanagement operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations? CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wettling or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to Inansport 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? 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? It the answer is yes, answer question of the distribution of the proof. If the answer is yes, answer question complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question. | • | | U | | |
|---|--------|--|------|-----|-------|
| 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 OCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR couditioned (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? 8. Was CCR spillage observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective aglion 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 | ÷ | | Yes | No. | Notes |
| localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations? CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable 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 getion 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 | CCR L | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | 84) | r | |
| containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) 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 susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | 1; | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | | X | |
| within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable 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 clizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | 2. | containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption | | X | |
| 4. Was CCR received duting the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) 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 susceptable 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 | 3. | within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of | | X | |
| period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) 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 susceptable 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 | CCR Fu | | (4)) | | |
| suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, of was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale of 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 | 4. | period? If answer is no, no additional | X | | |
| 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? 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 | | suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? | X | | |
| 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | 6. | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not | | χ | |
| 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 | 7, | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | - | X | |
| ineasures 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 | , p | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. | | 1 | |
| complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. | X | | |
| 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? | | complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | X | |
| | 11. | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | 2 |

| | | • | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Additional Notes: | | | | |
| | | | | po t o m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m |
| and a second of the second of | | T. C C | - C. T. C. | The state of the s |
| • | | • | | *** |
| | dadiscolores perent a 1 a millo e | and a process because we are to | ela: linear llier i nalas | or remove the six |
| · 20 TO TO A \$255- 1 P \$44 TO TO \$40 PARTY (20 TO TO THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE TOTAL TO THE T | | W. 1 | | |