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

Date:	Inspector Vic	<del>₹ \\</del>			
Time:	3:27 Weather Conditions: - S	um	87	•	
	•	Yes	No	. Notes	
CCRL	ndfill 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		1/	1	
	CCR?		10		
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	į.			
	within the general landfill operations that				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR Fug	ptive 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			W	_
	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				į
	Suscentable to fingitive dust generation?	i	i		

Additional Notes:	. •

Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on

Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.

Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.

Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Were the citizen complaints logged?

landfill access roads?

8.

9.

10.

11.

8-27-24

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

Inspector. Weather Conditions: Yes. No Notes 1 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 CCR? 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? 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 5\_ suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? 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,

Additional Notes:	• •
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

describe recommended changes below.

Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question

Were the citizen complaints logged?

IO.

11.

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	8-15-24 Inspector.  7:47 Weather Conditions:	V3 4 .	WFILL				
Time:	7 47 W	Sun	7	64			
711116-	Weather Conditions:	<u> </u>	•				
<del></del>		Yes	N	0		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	.849					
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				l	_	
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ					
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing				ı		
	CCR?	.					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				/		
1	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.	İ	- 1			
	within the general landfill operations that	_[	;	1	/		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	-	1				
	the CCR management operations.						
CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)	(4))					
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	<del>```</del>	1			<del></del>	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1 1/	/	•		
	information required.						
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	<del> </del>					
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?						
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	<del> </del>	<del> </del>	-			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to						
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	-					
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			- 1			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		<del></del>				
	Iandfill access roads?	1	]			•	
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		<del>                                     </del>	_			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe				-		
	corrective action measures below.	 				•	1
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			_			<del></del>
	measures effective? If the answer is no,						ł
	describe recommended changes below.						
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	•	† <del></del>	+	·		
i	complaints received during the reporting						
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question						- 1
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			+			
ditional	Notes:						

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

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

Date:	Hy 8 -202 Inspector Cha	<u> </u>				
Time:_	10730 Weather Conditions:Co	<u> </u>	·	-		_
		. Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4				
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the	-			-	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1	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.		V	/		
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	41)	<u></u>	!	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.		V	<i>7</i> .		
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 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?					
dditional l	Notes:					

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: Auy 1 - 24 Inspector WHOW	-	
Time: 5005 Weather Conditions: 5arn		

		Yes	No	. Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	3 <b>4</b> )		
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			-
<u></u>	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?			
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.	V	·
CCRF	ugitive 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:	. •	
	: · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
_		_
	<del></del>	-
	i	