WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEPLENSING LANDFILL

Inspector Weather Conditions: Yes 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 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. 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? 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. 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 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEPTEMBELL

Date:_	S-11-20 Inspector	md (JAK.			
Time:_	Weather Conditions: . C'	loud,	HE.	<u> </u>		
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8					
-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		T	T		
	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		1.	+		
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?		ļ			
ے ک	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that	į				
	Tentesont a notantial discontinuous that		· _			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.					
			<u> </u>			
CCR Fo	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.					
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?					
	•					
dditional.	Notes:	- •				
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SEBLANSING LANDFILL

		Yes	No	Notes
CRLa	ındfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	4)		110163
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<u>-</u>	T	T .
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			
2.	CCR?	ļ		
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.			
			<u> </u>	
	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	•		
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		1	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			