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

Date:	Inspector:	And C	<u>ہے کے کس</u> ے		
Time: 1 45 Weather Conditions: 2/oil					
		. Yes	No	Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 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 operations that represent a potential disruption	İ			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	1			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		<u> </u>		
}	within the general landfill operations that	į			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		ĺ		
	the CCR management operations.				
COD To			<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		م ا		
	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				
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.		1		
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?	+		-	
A dditional Norman					

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	SKB LANSIN	(G LANDI	FILL		•	
Date: Inspector: Inspector:						
Time:	10-16-19 Inspector. Weather Conditions:	Let	.5.7	· ·		
	·	Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť			-	·
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		1		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		المسترسا	1,		
	CCR?			,		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
j	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	:				
	within the general landfill operations that	!		Ì		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of]		 - -		
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting					
1	period? If answer is no, no additional			ļ		
	information required.			Ì		
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					
İ	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			į		
1	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		ł			_
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					•
		<u>-</u>				
A 33747	127					

Auditional Notes:

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

Date: 10 -9-19 Inspector: Which We						
Time: 7)65 Weather Conditions: Cool 32						
-	·	Yes	No	Notes		
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	ĺ				
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ:				
_	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		l			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	į	ł			
	within the general landfill operations that	İ				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of					
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR 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		، ا			
	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		i.			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
		-				
Addītional 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: 10-7-19 Inspector: Challes						
Time: 12.45 Weather Conditions:						
	· ·	. Yes	No	Notes		
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 1)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í				
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ				
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			7,		
	CCR?					
• 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill					
İ	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		4			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u></u> 4))				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting					
1	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		1			
	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: 9-25-17 Inspector: Mallica						
Time: 9:05 Weather Conditions: - 6 10 - 1						
r		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	•	ı.			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			1		
· 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?			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 F	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u>4</u>))				
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			<u>-</u>		
9.	corrective action measures below.					
9-	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no.	1				
	describe recommended changes below.		l			
10.						
10-	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting	-	ļ			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
	170 TO OTTROIT COMPTANTES TORGETT					
Additional Notes:						
Auditorial Notes:						
	·					

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