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

	Inspector_ M				
Time:	725 - Weather Conditions: - Ve	vy 1	lo f	8.4	
		Yes	No	<u> </u>	Notes
CCRLa	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 49			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			T	
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ			
-	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	ľ	1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR Fug	ntive 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.				
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?	}	ĺ		-
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
ŀ	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	. [-	
	corrective action measures below.]		•
9-	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			····	
2	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1	-		
	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
C	complaints received during the reporting				
I	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1			
11. 7	Were the citizen complaints logged?				•

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

Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84) 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. 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? 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

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

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

Date:_	7-15-24 Inspector. Umd	Ony			
Time:_		un in		•	
		Yes	No	L	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: 4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	1			•
	localized settlement observed on the	F			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			†′	
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
ļ	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			1	
	within the general landfill operations that	i	}		
{	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				•
CCR F	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))			
4_	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		ļ		•
	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.				•
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				
77	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				-
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
.ddītional	Notes			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
سسيسما	Trotes.				

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date:_	1-8-24 Inspector	In	<u>ئى، 1</u>	_		
Tīme:_	7:30 Weather Conditions:	Suna		-		
	,	Yes	No		27.	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.		1 140		Notes	
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	-;	- 1	- 		
	localized settlement observed on the	` i			•	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1 4	/ ,		
-	CCR7					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	.				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill 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	<u>:</u>				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	ε ·	1 C			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR.Ft	rgitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(<u>4</u>))				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	1	T ,			
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1		
	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			İ		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					
8_	Iandfill access roads?	,	ļ			
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe					
	corrective action measures below.	•			-	ĺ
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		1 1			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				<u> </u>	
			<u>-</u>			
ldītīonal.	Notes:					
	-					

Q:\Waste Connections\Lensing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 xlsx



WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	7-1-24	SKB/DANSING LANDEUL
Date:_	-7 2-1	Inspector_ UMA WANG
Time:_	9:05	Weather Conditions: 6 W C128 68
	•	

		Yes	No	. Notes
CCRI	Landfill 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?		レ	-
- 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?		V	
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>		
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	<u>(4)</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 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.		7	-
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?		 	-
_			,	J.

7.7.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C		
	•	
		
	<u>-</u>	
-	•	
	•	