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

Date:_	3-28-23 inspector. $1/40$	Way			
Time:_	9.27 Weather Conditions:	Sun	~ ~	24	
		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: 4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ĺ	1,		-
	localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1,	
	CCR7 .]'	
- 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?			1	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	within the general landfill operations that				
ļ	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1/		
	the CCR management operations.	!			
CCR Ft	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	<u> </u>	!	
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	1			•
	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,	ĺ	j		
	describe recommended changes below.	Í	[
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:				

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

ime:_	3-21-73 Inspector. 14	unn		28	
	<u> </u>	Yes	No		Notes
CRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				•
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1 1/	1	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
2					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1 a		
	operations that represent a potential disruption			1	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or		 	-	····
٦.		į.	}		
	within the general landfill operations that	İ	1 1	1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				•
CRFt	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional		'	1	
	information required.		ŀ	ļ	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		1	[
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to				•
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		í		
	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.		- 1		-
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	İ	1		
	describe recommended changes below.	ľ			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting	[1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
	1 tomprants toggent				
	•				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKIPLANSING/LANDFILL

Weather Conditions: OUN CUS 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. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresents) 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 Iandfill access roads? 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 SKE/DANSING LANDFILL

Date:	3-7-7-3 Inspector:	mea			
	9:40 Weather Conditions: S	ens.		-	
		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	8 4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	.		<u> </u>	•
j	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	.		1	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?	-	-	_	
3-	Were conditions observed within the cells or	į.			
	within the general landfill operations that	.[
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.			1	
CCRF	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.			1	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		 		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-	ļ	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	•	 	 	
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to				r
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		}		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		Į		
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.	ļ			•
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	-			

Additional Notes:	• •
•	

complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Were the citizen complaints logged?

11.

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	Z-Z z - Z 3 Inspector. Weather Conditions:	NG LAND	afill An		-	
Time:	1. Z (Weather Conditions: _ · C	210cl	7	-		
<u> </u>		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			T	-	
	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?		0			
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.	:-				
CCRFq	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))				
<u>4.</u>	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?					
ddītional l	Notes:					