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

Time:	7.30 Weather Conditions:	SARN	<u>أ</u> أ	- de a
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 34)		
-	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?			
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 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 SKB LANSING LANDFILL

ime:_	₩eather Conditions: Se	21 01 -	<u>3C</u>	
		Yes	No	Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť	1	
	localized settlement observed on the	F		
	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	[†
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i		
	within the general landfill operations that	Ė		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			+
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Ft	ngitive 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.		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?			
	1055001			

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	12.45 KM Weather Conditions: Suv	Yes	No	Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	': 4)	1 2.0	110205
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.		<i>-</i>	
CR F	ngitive 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.	-		
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?			<u> </u>

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB_LANSING LANDFILL

T:			~~	
1 me:	7:40 Weather Conditions:	12		·
		. Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	undfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 1)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	ĺ		-
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		a statement of the stat
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			·
	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	į		
	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))	,	,
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		i /	
	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		<u> </u>	
	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?			
		<u>.</u> 1		