WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	9-15-20 Inspector Inspector	IC LAND	FILL		•	
Time:_	9-15-20 Inspector. U	unt	77	<u> </u>		
		Yes	No	T	Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)				
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ĩ -		T		
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ				
1 -	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1/	1,		
	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?		l i/			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	6	-			
	within the general landfill operations that					
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		ا ا			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))				
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?		-			
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?					-
Additiona	l Notes:					
	·					
•						

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	9-27-20 Inspector: M	<u>du</u>		
Time:	3 2 Weather Conditions: 40+	-		
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 9		
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·
	localized settlement observed on the	:		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			I
2.	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		_ ز	+
	operations that represent a potential disruption			
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or			
J.				
	within the general landfill operations that			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		1	
		······································		
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	9))		
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	1		
	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?			
itional	Notes:			
	:			
•				

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

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.		No V	Notes	
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 th				
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 th				
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				
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	a.			
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	a.			
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	a.			
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	a.			
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	į			
Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of	f			
within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of	f			
represent a potential disruption of the safety o	f			
	f	/	1	
the CCD management angestions		1		
me cox management obergnous.	1			
Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		I	
Was CCR received during the reporting	1	T		
period? If answer is no, no additional	1	,		
information required.		1		
Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?				
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?	j			
Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
landfill access roads?	1		•	
Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	_			
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?				
1 ozo ere ereren combiames togged (
nal Notes:				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKELLING LANDFILL

Date:	Inspector:	100	\sim	
Time:	7.10 Weather Conditions: 0	www c	22 31	·
	1	. Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	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?			
- 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.	1		
CCR Fu	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.	The state of the s		
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_2015xlsx

Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEPTIANSING LANDFILL

Date:_	T-1-20 Inspector	dWg	-		
Time:_	1:15 Weather Conditions:	(0-1		-	
Γ	·	. Yes	No	Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 4)			
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í —			 -
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1,	
	CCR?				
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption		/		
3.	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			1	
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	())	<u></u>	<u> </u>	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	-))	<u> </u>	T _c	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		/		
•	information required		<i>i</i> /		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
٥.	cumprescents) prior to 3-15-15-15 at 3-15-15		· •		
6.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?				
0.	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			•	ĺ
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	,			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
dditional	Notes:	. •			
	:				
				- -	

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	Inspector M	<u>~205</u>	<u>a</u>	
Time: (Weather Conditions: 5	sha_	<u>O</u> ;	<u> </u>
		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 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?		v	
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.			
	igitive 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.	-	i V	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	· -	
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