WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT				
6	SKB LANSING LANDFILL			
Date: 5-0-16 Inspector: Tamus (201)				
Time: 11. Co AM Weather Conditions: Dav Hy Sunny 60				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\bigcirc_{Yes}	No	Notes
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<u>*)</u>		T
	localized settlement observed on the			<u>'</u>
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1/	1,
	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			
ļ	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		1. /	Dellas las
6.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			BOTOMATON
0.	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		1/	, ·
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1/		
	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.
Additional Notes:				