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

Time: Weather Conditions: Clove Tes No Notes  CCR Landfill 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 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.  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 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 coptrol measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive flust coptrol measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	Date:_	4-1-20 Inspector. CM	-2006	- N		
CCR Landfill 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 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 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 figitive 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?	Time:_		My	- COO,	<u> </u>	_
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.  CCR Fogitive Dnst 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?			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.  CCR Fogitive Dnst 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?	CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 3 <b>4</b> )			
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.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$257.30(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?		Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the	<u> </u>			
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 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?	-	CCR?			ſ	
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?		containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?				
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?	3.	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
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?	CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(h)(	41)	<del></del>		
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?		Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional	,,			<del></del>
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.					
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-	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
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?			•	
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.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			•	
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.	measures effective? If the answer is no,				
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	-			
ddītional Notes:	11.					· .
	.ddītional	Notes:				
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>					

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

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

1-8-70 Inspector: Time: 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 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 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? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on 7. 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:

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10\_2015xlsx

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	4-15-20 Inspector M	700	7- p		·	
Time:_	3 10 Weather Conditions: 2	120°C 1	n-st.	1 AM		_
		. 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	ľ	1			
} .	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			+		
	CCR?					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
l	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1				
	operations that represent a potential disruption					
<del> </del> -	to ongoing CCR management operations?					_
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i				
	within the general landfill operations that		1.			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1	T		
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Ft	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					
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?					
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		<del> </del>		<del></del>	
	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				<del></del>	
	landfill access roads?	•			•	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		-			<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,	į	1			
	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>			•
			——— <u> </u>			
dditional	Notes:					
<del></del>	:					

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