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

ime:_	12-6-21 Inspector: Weather Conditions: C	low	L	
	•	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 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?		L	
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.		\/ \/	
CR Fr	igitive 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.		1	
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?			<u> </u>

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKB-KANSING LANDFILL Weather Conditions: Yes No NotesCCR 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 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? Additional Notes

x x 4 4 4 4 6 6 6 5 -	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	:
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
_	
	:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: / 2	?-20-21	SKB LAInspector:	NSING LAND	FILL SI/	•
Time:	17.05 We	ather Conditions:	Co1d	.V-	•
			Yes	No	Notes

	7		·, ····	·
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	1 4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í		
}	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		<u> </u>	- T-
	CCR?			<u> </u>
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
ł	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	ļ	-	1
	within the general landfill operations that	f	i i	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.		:	
CCR Ft	ıgitive 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		1	
	corrective action measures below.			·]
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	İ		1
	describe recommended changes below.			{
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		1	ì
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
				1

Additional Notes:	· •
	•