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

Date: 9-27-22 Inspector: _____

Time: 9:36 Weather Conditions: Sunny Cool

| | | Yes | No | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)** | | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | X | |
| 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? | | X | |
| 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. | | X | |
| **CCR Fugitive 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

## SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 9-20-22 Inspector: [signature]

Time: 2:41 Weather Conditions: Sunny 79

| | | Yes | No | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)** | | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | X | |
| 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? | | X | |
| 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. | | X | |
| **CCR Fugitive 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
## SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 9-13-22 Inspector: [signature]

Time: 12:45 Weather Conditions: Sunny

| | | Yes | No | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)** | | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | X | |
| 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? | | X | |
| 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. | | X | |
| **CCR Fugitive 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. | | X | |
| 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
## SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date: 9-6-22 Inspector: [signature]

Time: 8:30 Weather Conditions: Cloudy

| | | Yes | No | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)** | | | | |
| 1. | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | X | |
| 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? | | X | |
| 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. | | X | |
| **CCR Fugitive 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. | | X | |
| 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: