## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SEE LANSING LANDFILL Inspector 3 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 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. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen 10. complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEE DANSING LANDERL

Date:	9-15-27 Inspector.	1 to	Jan			
Time:_	9-15-27 Inspector. Weather Conditions:	10:1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	<u> </u>	Yes	No		Notes	
CCR Lz	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4) 4)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				•	
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ.		}		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	ti		
	CCR?					
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		,	1		
	operations that represent a potential disruption					
	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	ļ		Ì		
	within the general landfill operations that	j.				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		ر د ا			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Fo	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					
	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.	i			•	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control					
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	Ì				
	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					
Additiona	. '					
-чапопа	I INOTES:	•				

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

Date:_	9-8-21 Inspector.	ism	)		
Time:_	7:45 Weather Conditions:	Sun	<u>le</u>	<u>ک .</u>	<u>.</u>
	·	Yes	No	Note	es
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 19			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•	
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			
1.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		رز	fr	
	CCR?				
- 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?  Were conditions observed within the cells or				<del>-</del>
3-	•	į		1	
	within the general landfill operations that				
-	represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		r /		
CCRF	fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	T	· · · · · · · · ·		
1	period? If answer is no, no additional		~/		
	information required.	ļ			•
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	j			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
	.*.				
Addition	al Notes:				

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

Date:	9-2-21 Inspector: (1) m/ War								
Time:	10:50 Weather Conditions: · · · · · ·	+ 1	le in	TONY 8) ~					
		Yes	No	Notes					
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)									
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			·					
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ	1						
1.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1					
	CCR?		V						
· 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells								
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1						
	operations that represent a potential disruption		/ن ا						
-	to ongoing CCR management operations?								
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	l !							
Ì	within the general landfill operations that								
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of								
	the CCR management operations.								
CCR F	CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))								
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		7						
	period? If answer is no, no additional		ا / ب						
	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		İ						
	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		ļ						
	corrective action measures below.	]	1	•					
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control								
1	measures effective? If the answer is no,								
	describe recommended changes below.	j							
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	•	•						
	complaints received during the reporting								
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1						
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?								
Additional Notes:									