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

Date:	Inspector:	<u> </u>		
Time:	10:30 Weather Conditions: Sich	ny !		
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	F)		
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?		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	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.			Botton Ash.
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?		1	
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.		<i>y</i>	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	·	Ĺ	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
Addition	nal Notes:			

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

	Inspector: Inspector:	~ · l		
Time:	Weather Conditions:			
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	P)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		Ê	
· 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.		<i>i</i> ⁄	
CCR 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 information required.			Bottom or
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?		1	·
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.	i		
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?			

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

me:	72.75 Weather Conditions:			
		Yes	No	Notes
CR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: F)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the	:		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			T
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 Fr	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.	ě.		Botton Heh_
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		· .	j i
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.	1/		
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?		- V	•

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015.xlsx

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Weather Conditions: _ Notes Yes No CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing 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? 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)) Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 5. suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR 6. conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on 7. 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. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen 10. complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Additional Hotes:				
		:		
		i i		
			 	······································
	•			
	•		~	
				

Were the citizen complaints logged?

11.