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

me:	12:00 Weather Conditions:	non	<i>J</i>	•
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	andfill 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	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?		î/	
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.	744.		
CR Fu	ugitive 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.	1		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		. /	Bottom 181
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?		<b>V</b> .	·
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		V	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	V		
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?		WA	
ddition:	al Notes:			
				~

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

Time: 7.32 Weather Conditions: 7.84 No Notes  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 CCR?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells 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 rigitive dust generation?  8. Was CCR fugitive dust generation?  9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures 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?		Inspector:		<del></del>	
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 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? 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?	Time:	Weather Conditions: //a, n			•
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 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 landfil?  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?			Yes	No	Notes
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 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 landfil?  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?	CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	E)		
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 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?		Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	:		1
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? 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?	· 2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?			
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?	3.	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of		i/	
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?	CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	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, 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?	4.	period? If answer is no, no additional			
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?	5.			٠;٠	Batton new
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?	6.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
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?	7.			V.	
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?	8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		/	
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
		complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		V	
Additional Notes:	11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		MA	
	Additions	Il Notes:	. •		
•					

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

Date: 3 C Weather Conditions: 5 No Notes    Fes No Notes	Date: 10-11-17 Inspector: Inspector:					
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 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	Time: 3. 20 Weather Conditions: Suna					
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 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 landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures 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?				No	Notes	
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 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 landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures 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?	CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	F)			
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	:	V		
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 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?	· 2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?				
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?	3.	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of		·/		
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?	CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))			
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?	4.	period? If answer is no, no additional	0/			
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?	5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			Rotton Ash	
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?	6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
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?	7.	- I	(			
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?	8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		Ú		
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	9.	measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.				
· .	10.	complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question				
	11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		WIR		
Additional Notes:	Addition	nal Notes:	, -	,		

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	Inspector:	<u> </u>	<del></del>		
Time: 8:36 Weather Conditions: Cloudy					
	1	Yes	No	Notes	
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	E)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·	
	localized settlement observed on the	:			
١.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1/5	1	
	CCR?				
· 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
1	operations that represent a potential disruption				
<u> </u>	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.				
			L		
CCR 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		/	811	
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			botton K8	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
<u> </u>	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		1	•	
	landfill access roads?				
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		i/	•	
1	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.			•	
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	/			
	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?			1/14	
				/ . !	
Additiona	il Notes-	. •			
ALUULULZ	u mores.				