WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT Inspector. 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 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? 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. و. 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

Additional Notes:	· ·
	•
-	***************************************
	1

period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Were the citizen complaints logged?

11.

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

ime:	1 30 Weather Conditions:	7 4 6	56	Bunz	
	·	Yes	No		Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: P)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				
	localized settlement observed on the	<u> </u>			
•	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1,	
	CCR?				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption		V		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			1	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that	•	/	†	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		X	1	
	the CCR management operations.		( \		
R Fn	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	D)	1	1	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	-93		T	
••	period? If answer is no, no additional		X		
	information required.			1	
 5 <sub>-</sub>	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
J.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
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				
	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.	_			•
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		į		
	describe recommended changes below.				
.0.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting	1			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1		
1.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
	Notes:				

## · WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	0-11-22 Inspector	~~	tey/		
Time:_	3:07 Weather Conditions: Cla	oly.			
	·	Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	<b>(4</b> )			
I.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ţ <u> </u>		1	
	localized settlement observed on the	•			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X	1	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	İ			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1 ./		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		X		
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.				
CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		1		
	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		j		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
	Iandfill 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.		1		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			<del></del>
	complaints received during the reporting	1	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	İ			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
7.7.5.5.5	, NT				
lditional	INOTEST	•			_

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKB DANSING LANDFILL

	10-4-77 Inspector: Simple Conditions: Simple Simple Conditions: Simple	ynny	<u>63</u>	•	
	•	Yes	No	T.	Notes
CCR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	<u>:</u> 4)		<del>-1</del>	······································
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť		1	
	localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		×	1	
- 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.	<u>.</u>	X		
CCR Fu	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.	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?		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
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 xls=