WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	1-30-23 Inspector V	NGLANI	FILL		,
Time:_	9:35 Weather Conditions: - U	J. inly	15	•	
	*	. Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 8 4)		-	
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		1	1 -	
1	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing				
	CCR?	1		ľ	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1		1,	
	operations that represent a potential disruption	.	/	1	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	within the general landfill operations that	ļ.			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	:		ł	
	the CCR management operations.				
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))		I	
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	l			•
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	j			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		Ĭ		
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,	1	1		
	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?				-
dditional	Notes:				

Additional Notes:	• •
	•
-	
	:

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

	Weather Conditions: Sw. 1 Idfill 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	Yes	721 No		Notes -
2.	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		No	1	Notes
2.	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	: 1 1 1 1		1	-
2.	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	-		1	
	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			1	
	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				
	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		/		·
	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				
3.	operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or		/	-	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or		1 /		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		/		
3.			1 0		
		i.		1	
	within the general landfill operations that		ļ		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1		
	the CCR management operations.		V		•
CR Fugi	tive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	 £))	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	L	
	Was CCR received during the reporting		<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1/	•	
	information required		V		
	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		•		
	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		ļ		
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	J			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7-	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on]			•
	andfill access roads?				
	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		į	•	
	andfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1		
	onective action measures below.				
9. A	are current CCR fugitive dust control	1	1		
	neasures effective? If the answer is no,				
	escribe recommended changes below.				
1	Vere CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	omplaints received during the reporting	1			
P	eriod? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	1		
LI. W	Vere the citizen complaints logged?				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	2-14-23 Inspector: NA	de LANI)		-
Time:_	2-14-23 Inspector: NATURE Weather Conditions: OV	'n Cit	st :	3 (:	
		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: 4)			
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or 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?				
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.	į.			
CCR F	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))			
<u>4</u> _	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?			Mineral de montre de la companya de	
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?				-
lditional	Notes:				

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

CCR Landfill II 1. Was I locali sides! CCR: 2. Were contai operation ong 3. Were within repress the CC CCR Fugitive Diagram of the CC period inform 5. Was a suppression of the condition of the	conditions observed within the cells	or	No	3:4	Notes
1. Was I locali sides! CCR? 2. Were contai operate to ong 3. Were within repress the CC CCR Fugitive Deficient of the CC period inform 5. Was a suppre 6. If respected in the CC condition of the	bulging, sliding, rotational movement of ized settlement observed on the lopes or upper deck of cells containing?	7.84) or	No	1.	Notes
1. Was localisides! CCR? 2. Were contain operation ong stoong st	bulging, sliding, rotational movement of ized settlement observed on the lopes or upper deck of cells containing?	or			
Iocali sides! CCR: CCR: CCR: CCR: CCR: CCR: CCR: CCR	ized settlement observed on the lopes or upper deck of cells containing ? conditions observed within the cells	ľ			
sidesi CCR. 2. Were contai operat to ong 3. Were within repres the CC CCR Fugitive D 4. Was Co period inform 5. Was at suppre 6. If resp conditit landfill suscept 7. Was Co landfill correcti 9. Are cur	lopes or upper deck of cells containing 7 conditions observed within the cells	.		1	•
CCR. CCR. Were contain operation ong and to ong and t	? conditions observed within the cells	·	I		
contai operai to ong 3. Were within repres the CC CR Fugitive Di 4. Was Condition suscept 7. Was Condition 8. Was Condition landfill suscept 9. Are cur		-	i	Ti	
operation ong 3. Were within repress the CC CR Fugitive Di 4. Was Coperiod inform 5. Was at suppre 6. If resp condition landfill susception 7. Was Collandfill Susception 8. Was Collandfill correction 9. Are cur					
to ong 3. Were within repres the CC CR Fugitive D 4. Was C period inform 5. Was a suppre 6. If resp conditi landfill suscepi 7. Was C landfill 8. Was C landfill correcti 9. Are cur	ining CCR or within the general landfi				
3. Were within repress the CO CR Fugitive Draws Conditions and the conditions are conditions. Was Conditions are conditions are conditions are conditions. Was Conditions are conditions are conditions are conditions.	tions that represent a potential disrupti	on	1		
within repress the CO CR Fugitive Driver Dri	going CCR management operations?				
repress the CC CR Fugitive Dr 4. Was Coperiod inform 5. Was as suppress 6. If resp condition landfill suscept 7. Was Collandfill correction 9. Are cur	conditions observed within the cells or	r			
the CC CR Fugitive D 4. Was C period inform 5. Was a suppre 6. If resp conditi landfill suscepi 7. Was Co landfill correcti 9. Are cur	the general landfill operations that	į.		 	
CR Fugitive Di 4. Was Congress 5. Was as suppres 6. If respondition and fill susception 7. Was Condition 8. Was Condition 8. Was Condition 9. Are cur	ent a potential disruption of the safety	of			`_
4. Was Coperiod inform 5. Was a suppre 6. If resp condition landfill suscept 7. Was Collandfill correction 9. Are cur	CR management operations.				•
period inform 5. Was a suppre 6. If resp condition landfill suscept 7. Was Condition landfill was Condition landfill correction 9. Are cur	ust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		J	
5. Was a suppre 6. If resp condition landfill suscept 7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correction 9. Are cur	CCR received during the reporting				
5. Was a suppre 6. If resp conditi landfil suscept 7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	l? If answer is no, no additional		i/		
5. Was a suppre 6. If resp conditi landfil suscept 7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	nation required.				
suppre 6. If resp conditi landfill suscept 7. Was Co landfill 8. Was Co landfill correcti 9. Are cur	II CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	<u>. </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
6. If resp conditi landfill suscept 7. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	sants) prior to delivery to landfill?	-			
conditi landfili suscep 7. Was Co landfili 8. Was Co landfili correcti 9. Are cur	onse to question 5 is no, was CCR				
7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	ioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1		•
suscept 7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	l working face, or was the CCR not		7		
7. Was Collandfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	table to fugitive dust generation?	1	i		
landfill 8. Was Collandfill correcti 9. Are cur	CR spillage observed at the scale or on			-	
landfill correcti 9. Are cur	l access roads?				·
9. Are cur	CR fugitive dust observed at the	1		-	
9. Are cur	? If the answer is yes, describe				_
	ive action measures below.	_[]			•
imeacitre	rent CCR fugitive dust control				
	es effective? If the answer is no,	1 1	1		
	e recommended changes below.		}		
	CR fugitive dust-related citizen			·	
complai		1 1			
	ints received during the reporting	1			
11. Were th	ints received during the reporting If the answer is yes, answer question		1		