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

ne:	7:00 4 m Weather Conditions: C/o	Yes	No	Notes
77D T 61	adfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	1		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		1	•
1.	localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1
	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	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.			
		41)	<u> </u>	
	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(·-//	•	
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?			BSHOW ASh
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 -	1 A 1 /\

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

e: <u> </u>		Yes	No	Notes
	adfill 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?			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 represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.			
TR Ku	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?		·/	BOHAM A
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		Ü	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<u> </u>		
	nal Notes:			•