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

Date:	4-18-18 Inspector: Chad	الم		
Time:_	715 Am Weather Conditions: We	+ 5	now	f1029-16-18
	j	. Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	<b>P</b> )		
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			
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	1		
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?  Were conditions observed within the cells or			
3.	within the general landfill operations that	ļ.		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
		· (1)		L
	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))	<del></del>	<del>v</del>
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		. /	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		5/	
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		•	
6.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			
0.	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?			-
	,			

Additional Notes:

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

Date:	4-11-18 Inspector: Wall	ithen	<del></del>	
Time:	12:30 Weather Conditions: 5a	nay		·
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	P)		
1.				·
Ì	localized settlement observed on the	<u>:</u>		
۱.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		<u> </u>	I
	CCR?			
· 2.				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		<b>)</b>	
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1/		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		<del></del>	
3.	ž			
Ì	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			
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			
Į.	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.				
ŀ	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		}	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	i		
	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?			

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

Date:	4-4-18 Inspector: \\	d With	<del></del>	
Time:_	3:30 Weather Conditions: Cloud	7 (	ملط	
	,	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: E)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
	localized settlement observed on the	:		
1	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.			
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		V	
ļ	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			
1	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			<u> </u>
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
	,			

Additional Notes:				
	:			
	;			
<del></del>				
•				
	;		~	
	<del></del>			
	Í	•		
		•		

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

Date:_	3-28-18 Inspector: ( )	-du-	2	
Time:_	9:301m Weather Conditions: Sun	ny C	obe	•
	•	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	F)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·
ŀ	localized settlement observed on the	•		
1	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	i/		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		<u> </u>	
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		. /	,
	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			·
L	landfill access roads?			
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			-
1	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			
7.7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			-
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
				•

Additional Notes:

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

Date:	3-21-18 Inspector: Uwd	Wax		
Time:	12:00 Weather Conditions: . Clou	di_		
	1	Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	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 CCR?			I
· 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.	V		
CCR Fu	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.			
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?			