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

Date:	1-27-27 Inspector	) u	<u> </u>	
Time:	12:00 Weather Conditions: . S	ing	wide	1 . 176
·	·	. Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: <del>1</del> )		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Í	1	T .
	localized settlement observed on the	<u>}</u>		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1 0	1
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	<u> </u>		
]	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
ł	operations that represent a potential disruption			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			-
į	within the general landfill operations that	Į.	,	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			+
	the CCR management operations.			
~~~~			<u> </u>	1
	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u>4))                                   </u>		
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional		l -	
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		_	
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		_	İ
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			<u>-</u> 
	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	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?			•
<del></del>				
dditional	. '			
سسيسانانا	.110122-	·		

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

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKALANSING LANDFILL

ime:	3:00 Weather Conditions: Sc	- nry	21	•	
		Yes	No		Notes
CR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 1)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	:	L	-	
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.		2		
R Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<del>1</del> ))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		V		
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?				

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

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: 7-13-22 Inspector Mall

Time:	10:15 Weather Conditions: . Co.			
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	:	0	-
- 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.		V	
CCRF	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.			
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:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT LANDFILL 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. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 5. 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? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on 7. 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? 11.

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2	چوا <del>د 2</del> 105
	XXXXXXX

Additional Notes: