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

Date:	1-10-18 Inspector:	I Wat	m	
Time:_	1-10-18 Inspector:	<u>d</u> - v	v. ih	
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill 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		1/	1
	CCR?			
. 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption	i/		
	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.			
CCRF	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		. /	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		<i>i</i> /	
	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	nal Notes:	. •		

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL 17-18 Inspector () had () 20

ne:	1-17-18 Inspector: Sun	in C	01//	
		Yes	No	Notes
CR 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
· 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	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
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			
	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			
	Iandfill 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?			-