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

Date:	4 = 10	Inspector.	JANGU &		
Time:	\$:15	Weather Conditions: _	-Rain	Lin	-fon Dry 1
			. Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	andfill Integrit	y Inspection (per 40 CF.	R §257.84)		
1.		, sliding, rotational move			·
		tlement observed on the			
-	sīdeslopes or CCR?	upper deck of cells cont	aining		1
· 2.		ions observed within the			
		CR or within the general			
	operations th	at represent a potential di	isruption		
	to ongoing C	CR management operation	ons?		
3.	Were conditi	ions observed within the	cells or		
	within the ge	neral landfill operations t	hat !		
	represent a p	otential disruption of the	safety of		
		nagement operations.			
CCR Fo	igitive Dust Ins	pection (per 40 CFR §2	57.80(b)(4))	<del></del> _	L
4.		ceived during the reportin			
		iswer is no, no additional			
	information	-			
5.		conditioned (by wetting	or dust		
		prior to delivery to landfi		.	
6.		question 5 is no, was CO			
, <del>-</del>		(wetted) prior to transport			
		ing face, or was the CCR			
		o fugitive dust generation			
7.		Ilage observed at the scal	l l		
,-	landfill acces	s roads?	.01010		•
8.		gitive dust observed at the			
		ie answer is yes, describe			-
		ion measures below.			•
9.		CR fugitive dust control			
	measures effe	ctive? If the answer is no	) <sub>-</sub>	1 1	
		mmended changes below.			
10.		gitive dust-related citizen			
		ceived during the reporting			
	period? If the	answer is yes, answer qu	restion		
11.	Were the citiz	en complaints logged?		-	
			1	1	

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

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

Weather Conditions:    Yes   No	Date:	Inspector. CMC	WAY				
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?  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.  3. Was CCR reserved during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was CCR rodationed (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 landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes 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 reserved during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	Time:	Weather Conditions: 1/10	, We	<i>f</i> -	7 in	Ran	forc
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.  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.  3. Were conditioned (ber 40 CER \$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 frigitive dust generation?  7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  8. Was CCR figitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR firgitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints reserved during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?			Yes	No		Notes	
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.  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.  3. Were conditioned (ber 40 CER \$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 frigitive dust generation?  7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  8. Was CCR figitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR firgitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints reserved during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)				
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.  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.  3. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If the sanswer is no, was CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) 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?			Í			•	
CCR?  Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?  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))  Was CCR received during the reporting period? If the answer is no, no additional information required.  Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressants) prior to delivery to landfill?  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?  Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints repeived during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  Were the citizen complaints logged?			-				
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?		sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1		
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.  3. 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 suppressurs) 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?							
operations that represent a potential disruption to engoing 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 suppressants) 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? 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?	· 2.	•					
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.  3. 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?				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 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?		<del>_</del>					
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? 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?							
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 flugitive 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?	3-			1			
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 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?			ĺ				
CR 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?							
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?		the CCR management operations.					
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 frigitive 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?	CCR F1	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))	<u> </u>			
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?	4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			/		
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?		period? If answer is no, no additional					
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?							
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?	5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust					
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?		suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		·			
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?	6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR					
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?							
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?				İ			
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?		susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					
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?	7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					<del></del>
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?							•
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?	8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the					<del></del>
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?		landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			•		
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?		corrective action measures below.				•	
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?	9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control					·
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?							
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?							
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	10.				·		
period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		complaints received during the reporting					
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
iditional Notes:	11.			-			•
ldītional Notes:							
	dditiona	il Notes:	- •				

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

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

Date:	9-9-19 Inspector:	rele	<u> </u>	-		
Time:	12.45 Weather Conditions: 5 5 5					
	3	1		<del>:</del>		
r		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		â			
-	sideslopes of upper deck of cells containing			1		
· 2.	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells		-	<u> </u>		
2-	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		<del> </del>			
	within the general landfill operations that	į.				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1			
	the CCR management operations.					
~~~~		l	<u> </u>	<u></u>	<del></del>	
	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))	T			
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,					
10	describe recommended changes below.					
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			-	
	complaints received during the reporting					
11.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					-
77-	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
Additiona	l Notes:				•	
					-	

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

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

Date:	8-28-19 Inspector:					
Time: 7.30 Weather Conditions: 62						
		Yes	No	Notes		
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<del>Ĩ</del>	T			
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ				
	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	ļ.	•			
	within the general landfill operations that	ŀ	,			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	1	5/			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Ft	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))	1.	<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			_		
l	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?					
Additiona	al Notes:	. •				
		<del></del>				

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