#### 

Date:			5			
Time: 11.35 Weather Conditions: Sunn						
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				-	
į	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?		ļ			
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.		1			
		l		L		
	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))	<del>,</del>			
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.						
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?				*	
T.T.	oto the orazon complaints loggen!	<u></u>				
Addition	ial Notes:					
	:				<del></del>	

# WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL -20-19 Ingrestor: 1/2/1/2 = -2/1

Date:_/	2-20-19 Inspector: <u>Vell</u>	E	1/1/2 sin	
Time:	$\frac{2-20-19}{12\cdot 15}$ Weather Conditions: $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}}$	h n l		•
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: F)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·
}	localized settlement observed on the	ľ		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1	1
	CCR?			
· 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			and the second s
	operations that represent a potential disruption			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i	•	
	within the general landfill operations that	•		
1	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
1	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	<del></del>		
1	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			
10-	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
	11 ere me crirren combiantes toggens			
	•			
Addition		<u> </u>		
	•			~

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

	8:05 Weather Conditions: SX	- c - c - c - c - c - c - c - c - c - c		
ime:	<u>₹ 0 &gt;</u> Weather Conditions: <u> </u>	10m)	<u> </u>	ol c
		. Yes	No	Notes
CR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	1) 		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
	localized settlement observed on the	İ		
•	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		i_	1
	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?		<i>い</i>	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
<i>9-</i>	within the general landfill operations that	į		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
-	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
	gitive 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?		<u> </u>	
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,			
10	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-		
	complaints received during the reporting		1	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question  Were the citizen complaints logged?			
11.				

### 

	Weather Conditions:	-(.00	<u> </u>	
		Yes	No	Notes
CR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4) 		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1 /	
	operations that represent a potential disruption			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i		
	within the general landfill operations that	•		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		<i>\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\</i>	
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	<del></del> 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?		. 1	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		<del> </del>	
	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?			

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

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

Date:	$i-30-19$ Inspector: $\sqrt{2}$	May				
Time:	8:45 Av Weather Conditions: Cold					
	·	Yes	No	Notes		
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: <b>4</b> )				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í				
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ				
-	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	·	1			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of					
	the CCR management operations.					
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		L			
	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					
7-	measures effective? If the answer is no,					
	describe recommended changes below.					
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	<del></del>				
10.	complaints received during the reporting					
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<del></del>				
77-	Mere me cruzen combiantis togged.		1			

Additional Notes:	• •		
	;		
•			
	:	•	