WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKR DANSING LANDFILL

Date:	7-28-20 Inspector.	mod V	JA)	
Time:	7-28-20 Inspector. (S) Weather Conditions: So	LVN4	· · · · · ·	
	1	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 3 4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the			·
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1 2	#
. 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	pitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))		<u> </u>
4 <u>.</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 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 frigitive 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?			None
dditional	Notes:			

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEE DANSINGLANDFILL

Time:_	Weather Conditions: 5	i in n			
~		. 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 CCR?		_	1	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1.		
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
٥.	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 Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(<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		<u> </u>	/ -	
	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				
77	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		-		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	V		Non	
	•			1000	-

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

	•	Yes	77-	
CR T	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8		No	Notes
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	约 丁	γ	
	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			f
	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	ŀ	. 1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(<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?	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,			
10	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-		
	complaints received during the reporting	<i>522</i>		
·11.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	0		
44-	Were the citizen complaints logged?	3		Won

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

)ate:	Inspector.	124C	<u>ve</u>	
ıme:	Weather Conditions:	MCA	<u>st-`</u>	•
		. Yes	No	Notes
CRL	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		ا ت	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			
	within the general landfill operations that	ļ:	. , /	1
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u>4</u>))	,	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	-37		
	period? If answer is no, no additional			
	information required	è		
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.		*		
1.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			-
8.	landfill access roads?		É.	
٥.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			-
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		/	
	corrective action measures below-		-	-
9.	Are current CCR fagitive dust control	1		
	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?			Noa

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEPLANSING LANDFILL

lime:	3.15 Weather Conditions:	10 inde	Y W	Acin	81
		Yes	No		Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	<u>:</u> 4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í	T	T	
	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		1 1	1	
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		ی.		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that	-			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		٤	1	
	the CCR management operations.				
CR Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(<u></u>		-l	
4	Was CCR received during the reporting				<u> </u>
	period? If answer is no, no additional		-		
	information required				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	<i>`</i>	•		
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?		2		•
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,	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?	1			Non
					102
ītional	Notes:				