WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date:	6-27=16 Inspector:	2 han			
Date: 6-2/=16 Inspector: Weather Conditions: Clovy					
Г	,	Yes	No	Notes	
CCR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		V		
· 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?		V		
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 F	ngitive 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				
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
Addition	al Notes:	, ·			

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date:	7-1-16 Inspector:	WAY			
Date:					
	,	Yes	No	Notes	
CCR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	:	V		
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?		V		
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 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 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				•
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
Addition	al Notes:				
	. :				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date:	Inspector:	rd Cin			
Date: 1-7-16 Inspector: 6 had on Time: 3:15 Weather Conditions: Sunn					
	<i>1</i> ∴	Yes	No	Notes	
CCR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				
	localized settlement observed on the	j			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	•	1	1	
	CCR?	ļ			
· 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		1		
	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption		<i>i ,</i>		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		-		
J.	within the general landfill operations that				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1 1 /		
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR Fr	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b))	(4))	·		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting) 			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	Ì		·	
	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,	[ļ		
	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
10.	complaints received during the reporting				
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
Addition	aal Notes:	. •			
	·			•	
					

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL

		to my	<u>~</u>	
Time:	10:10 Weather Conditions:	<u> </u>		
	,	Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	1)		·
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	:	V	
· 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.		V	
	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.			·
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	·		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
Addition	al Notes:			
				4
			•	