#### WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	Inspector:	WG O.		$\overline{}$
Time:	.7:45 Weather Conditions:	lons	L	
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)		-
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 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?			
Addition	al Notes:			
	<u> </u>			
	1			

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

Date:_	7-3-18 Inspector: MAC	idy		
Time:_	7-3-18 Inspector: Suh Weather Conditions: Suh	1	68	·
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	1)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·
	localized settlement observed on the			
1.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			l l
<u> </u>	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells	ļ		
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1/		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
1	within the general landfill operations that			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
CCRE	rugitive 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			
}	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
İ	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			
0.	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?			
Additio	nal Notes:			

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

Date:_	7-11-18 Inspector. Management 1:15 Weather Conditions: RG	dle	<u> </u>	
Time:_	1.15 Weather Conditions:	~	··· ·- ·	
	1	. Yes	No	Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	1) 		
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.			
CCRI	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.		<i>\( \)</i>	
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?			
Additio	nal Notes:	. •		
	·			

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

Date:	7-18-18 Inspector:	Jan				
Time:_	7:45 Weather Conditions: 54	nny	7	<u> </u>		
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4)				
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.					
CCRF	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?					
Addition	al Notes:				10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1	

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

ime:	Weather Conditions:	77	Mo	Notes
	·	Yes	No	Tyotes
CR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	)		1
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	:		·
	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1/		
	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption	R		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
٥.	within the general landfill operations that	1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
יים מיי	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	*//	7	<del></del>
4.	period? If answer is no, no additional			
	information required.		V	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
٥.	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?			
	i de la companya de			
ddition	al Notes:			