## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	7-5-17 Inspector: Management of the Management o	22~	80	had
me:	Weather Conditions:			
		Yes	No	Notes
CR Lar	ndfill 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
	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?		<del></del>	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		V	
	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))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	i/		
	information required.	<i>-</i>		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		.,/	Bottom reh
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			Dest on No.
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1/		
	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,	. /		
	describe recommended changes below.			•
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	•		
	complaints received during the reporting			<b>†</b>
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1 1	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			· N 14
		<u> </u>	1	

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL - 78 - 17 Inspector:

	7:16 Wester Conditions . Cloud	ار					
Time: 7:15 Weather Conditions: Clouds							
	<u>.</u>	Yes	No	Notes			
CR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	)	_				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•			
1.	localized settlement observed on the						
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			I			
•	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.						
CR 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	1/					
_	information required.						
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		/	Bottom ASK			
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			DOITON MS			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR						
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to						
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1/					
	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.	<u> </u>					
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	İ					
	complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		"				
				NK			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<u> </u>					

Additional Notes:

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

	Weather Conditions: Weather Conditions:	Yes	No	Notes
	10 0000 0000 000	L	210	
CR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	) 		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		Ì	
	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1	I
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells	1	, 1	
	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		V	
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
••	period? If answer is no, no additional			
5.	information required.	2		<i>a</i>
	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			Dottom
J.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			iffst.
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
0.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1/		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on	<u>.</u>		
7.	landfill access roads?			
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.		i/	
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
	describe recommended changes below.	<i>i</i> /		,
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		/	
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			NIA
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			1.19
43:45	nal Notes:	•		