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

Date:	Inspector:	pre wi	m		
ime:	1245 Weather Conditions: Sui	n ka	47_	•	
	1		7	-	
		Yes	No		Notes
CR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 1)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				-
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ			
	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			\uparrow	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	į			
	within the general landfill operations that	:			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CR 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			T	
	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				
	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		1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1			
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

	3:40 Weather Conditions: PiAv	7	77-	<i>-</i>	7.7
		Yes	No '	<u> </u>	Notes
	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			T!	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells	 			
2.	•			-	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		سر ز		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		 		
٠.	within the general landfill operations that	į.			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
CR Fu	ugitive 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.		ļ		
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:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	11-13-19 SKB LANSIN	GLAND	FILL			
Date:_	Inspector:	cucy		,		
Time:_	11-13-19 Inspector: W	16	wit	<u>.</u> .		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		. Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	<u>.</u> 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?		2			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		-			
	within the general landfill operations that	•				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		<u>' </u>		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting					
4	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:	·	
	;	
	1	
•	:	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

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

Date:_/	1-6-19 Inspector:	<u>~}U</u>	<u> </u>	
Time:	3:05 Weather Conditions: Main	3	\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	
		Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4) 		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·
ļ	localized settlement observed on the	ĺ		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			I
· 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?		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.			
	ine 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		<i>i</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			
	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			
9.	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?			
	108601			
Additiona	1 NT	. •		
иттоца	: 1101£2-			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

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

ime:	10-30-19 Inspector: Weather Conditions: U	12+	<u></u>	,
TITE:	y eather Conditions:			
		Yes	No	Notes
CR La	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			ľ
	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.		-	
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
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.		1	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting	ŀ	1	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		ĺ	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
	Lu ore ore combiguitte toffers	ı	j	

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