WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Date: 10-20-20

		Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			110263
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		T	T	
	localized settlement observed on the				•
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1	1	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		ث ا		
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
٥.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that		_		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			r	
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR F	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				
9_	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	Two Change			
11.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				•
~ - -	Were the citizen complaints logged?	1			

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Data: 1()-12-20

		Yes	No	T	77.6
CRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84		110		Notes
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			Т	
	localized settlement observed on the				•
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing				
	CCR?		i	17	
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.				
TR Fr	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4)		<u> </u>	L	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting))		·	
••	period? If answer is no, no additional				
	information required.			,	
5.					
٦.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		-		
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		l		
	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,		ļ		
	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	1			•
LI.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Date: 10 -6 - 70

		Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	<u>†</u> 1)			110263
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ĩ -		T	
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			•
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	Olivernos de la companya de la compa		1	
2_	Were conditions observed within the cells			 	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption			l	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that		1	-	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CR F	ngitive 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	ŀ		-	
	corrective action measures below.	ĺ			-
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,				
70	describe recommended changes below.				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	complaints received during the reporting	and the same of th	l		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				•
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEBLANSING LANDFILL

ime:_	Weather Conditions:			
		<u>Yes</u>	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 CCR?	The state of the s	- C	-
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?		C	
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.		V	
RFt	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.	TO THE PARTY OF TH		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.			
LO.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?			
 L1_		,		

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

ime:_	Weather Conditions:		•	•	سي	
	,		1			
		. Yes	No		Notes	
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	B)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				-	
	localized settlement observed on the					
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			11		
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		 	ļ		
	containing CCR or within the general landfill					
	operations that represent a potential disruption			T		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		·	 		
	within the general landfill operations that		1			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	-		1		
	the CCR management operations.		1.			
CR Fin	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4		I	L		
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?	ditting.			-	
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?					
tional	None					