March

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL 3-6-19 Inspector:

		Yes	No		Notes	
CR 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?		1			
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 F	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?			-		
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?					

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: 3 30 Weather Conditions: Sike LANSING LANDFILL

Time: 3 30 Weather Conditions:

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) 1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the	No	Notes
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		
llocalized settlement observed on the		-
1 1 1		
sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	3	T. Company of the com
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 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.		
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?		

Additional Notes:	. •	
	<u> </u>	
•		
		•

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

Date:	3-20-(9 Inspector: C) A		Wy _	
Time:_	12 20 Weather Conditions: Su	ing	Υ	•
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	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?			
· 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))		
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	٠		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

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

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	SKB LANSIN 3-27-19 Inspector:	GLAND	TILL		
Time:	7:30 Weather Conditions: 50	cu	7		
(·	Yes	No	Notes	
CCR Lai	adfill 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?	•			
- 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?		1		
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 Fug	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.		1		
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?		The state of the s		
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:	•		
	•		
	4		
	•		
•			
	•		
	:	•	

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

2410	mspector. V	<u></u>		
Time: Weather Conditions: COD				
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	ndfill 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?	-	C	
. 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?		L	
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.			
	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 suppresents) 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?			

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015_xlsx

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKBYLANSING LANDFILL

Date:_	4-10-19	Inspector:		
Time:_	11:00	Weather Conditions:		
	9		•	

		Yes	No	Notes
CCR 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 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	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?			·
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:	. •	
_		
	:	