WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKBLANSING LANDFILL

Date:	2-26-4020 Inspector: 1	Adl	\mathcal{N}			
Time:		7/00	_L^	> >V	u ca si	
			Tes .	No		Notes
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 8 4)				
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			<i>i</i> /		
-	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?	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.					
CCR Fug	utive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))			· -	
4 <u>.</u>	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 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.					
	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		-			
	Were the citizen complaints logged?					-
Additional :	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:	7-19-2020 Inspector	وبنائهم	1	
Time:	12:65 Weather Conditions: · C	1 outin	- <u>C</u> O	ld:
		Yes Y	No	Notes
CCRL	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 CCR?	:	i	
- 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.	Ī		
CCR F	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))		
<u>4.</u>	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?			
dditional	! 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:	6-12 2020 Inspector. \ \	md h	-\t-_	-
Time:	3:15 Weather Conditions: Sun	~	Y	
	7			
		. 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			1
	CCR?			
- 2-	Were conditions observed within the cells			_
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1 2	
	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	•		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.		[· .	
CCR Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u> </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?	ļ		
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.	1		•
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?			
				
iditional	. 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:_	1- 79- 2020 Inspector:	Sund		_	
Time:_	10.42 Weather Conditions:	ois			
	· ·	Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ī	1		•
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			
	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		1	1	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
5.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i		-	
	within the general landfill operations that	ľ			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR Ft	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(<u>(4)</u>)			
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?		٠	1	
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		
7.7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				·
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
dditiona	Notes:	. •			

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

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

-5 - 2020 Inspector. Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing 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 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? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the 8.

Additional Notes:				· •
		1	;	
•	-			
			<u>:</u>	•

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

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 received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Were the citizen complaints logged?

9.

10.

11.