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

Date:_	3 -25 - 202 Inspector_	m 27	چوت	2			
Time:_	3 -25-202 Inspector. 2 42 Weather Conditions:	Ver	$\subseteq I$	48f.	w	hen	
		. Ye.	5	No		Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: 3 <b>4</b> )					
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť			T		<del></del>
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ					
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			1	1		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				<del>                                     </del>		
	containing CCR or within the general landfill						
	operations that represent a potential disruption		- Company	1			
ļ	to ongoing CCR management operations?						
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				-	<del>-</del>	
	within the general landfill operations that	F	-				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				-		
	the CCR management operations.			. —			
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))					
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	<del></del>	T				
-	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		1.				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?						•
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		+				<u> </u>
	landfill access roads?					•	
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		+-		<del></del>		
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			ľ	-		
	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	<del></del>	-				
	complaints received during the reporting						
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question						-
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<del></del>	-				
							1

Additional Notes:	. •
	•
<del></del>	
-	•
•	

#### WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	Weather Conditions: Weather Conditions:				
		<u>Yes</u>	No		Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.	.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<del>.</del> 1			<del></del>
	localized settlement observed on the	<u> -</u>			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	-		Ti	
2	Were conditions observed within the cells				<del></del>
	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	f			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	Ε		Ī	
	the CCR management operations.				
CRF	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		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?		1		-
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		-	<del></del>	
	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			
	describe recommended changes below.	OF THE REAL PROPERTY.			
.0_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	- 1			
	complaints received during the reporting	Differentiame		•	
<del></del>	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1		•
1_	Were the citizen complaints logged?				<del></del>

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

Date:_	3-11-202 Inspector.	mb L	كـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	•	
Time:	Weather Conditions:	Clou	4	<u> </u>	£
<del></del>		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	849			
I.		- 1		<del></del>	
	localized settlement observed on the	·  -	-		•
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		7		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CCR7 .	.	1	7	
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	- Company		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			-	
	within the general landfill operations that	·		and the second s	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	E		<del> </del>	
	the CCR management operations.				
CCR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	طــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ		<u> </u>	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	1		T	
	period? If answer is no, no additional				
	information required				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	<del> </del>	<del> </del>		<u></u>
-	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		1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1		
7.					
/-	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?	'			
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
0_	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		t t	-	
	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_	Word CCD for the 2				
±0-	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	complaints received during the reporting			•	
11.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				-
	Were the citizen complaints logged?				<u> </u>
litional	Notes:				

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

Date:_	3-9-102 Inspector Va	<u>س له</u>			
Time:_	2:45 Weather Conditions: S	<u>uny</u>		-	
		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.8	: : <u>4</u> )			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť			
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			_   1	
· 2	Were conditions observed within the cells		1 4		
2_					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			-	
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
ے۔	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.		1. · U	The Constitution of the Co	
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	 <del>1</del> ))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			17	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1	Y	
	information required				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			ļ	
	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			<del></del>	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	1		•	
	corrective action measures below.	Til well			-
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		<del></del>		
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1			
	describe recommended changes below.				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting	CORPORA DE LA CO	1	ī	
[	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				•
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<del></del>			-
	1055011	1	1		

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKE/LANSINGLANDFILL

Date:_	7-25-20? ( Inspector_	70				
Time:	1.45 Weather Conditions:	Jind.	) (	old.		
		Yes	No	1	Notes	
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: RAD				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	7-7		1		
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			•	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1 ~	1		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				<del></del>	·····
	containing CCR or within the general landfill					
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1 2	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		, _	-		
	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	<u>'</u> '4))	J	<u> </u>		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			<u> </u>		<del></del> -
1.	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			<del></del>		·
	landfill access roads?		1		-	
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			<u> </u>		
	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,		1			
	describe recommended changes below.					W
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?					
dditional.	Notes:	. •				
	:			<del></del>		
<del></del>				•		

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

Date:_	Z-18- ZOZI Inspector 1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
Time:_	1000-	a nry	Cð	(d.	
		Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	<u>:</u> 4)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				•
	localized settlement observed on the	F		and the same of th	
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1,	
	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			1	
	within the general landfill operations that	!			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	÷))		Т	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		ī		
	information required			T	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	<del></del>		ļ	
J.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?				
6.					
0.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		l	977 C	
	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?	a) Conquestion	_		<u>-</u>
8.	<del></del>			<u>.</u>	
0-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			•	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	1			_
9.					
J-	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no,	**************************************			
	describe receive? If the answer is no,				
70	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	complaints received during the reporting	Control of the Contro		•	
7 7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1		•
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	•			

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	2-11 202 Inspector U	Lind	<u> </u>			
Time:	9.52 Weather Conditions: S	See un;	.6	cold		
	<u> </u>	Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 34)				
1_		<del></del>		<del></del>	_	
	localized settlement observed on the	-				
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			I		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells			1		
- C	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	ļ		-		
	within the general landfill operations that	ŀ	,			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			1		
<u> </u>	the CCR management operations.					
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,		1			
	describe recommended changes below.					
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			<del></del>	
	complaints received during the reporting			0		diseberga.
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	-				
	•				<del></del>	
dditional	Notes:					

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

Date:_	2-5-62 Inspectors	20			·	
Time:	2-5-62 Inspectors  Weather Conditions:	cold	•	•		
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	-: 849				
1-		<del></del>		<del></del> _	<del></del>	
1	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			-	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	<u> </u>			·	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1 8			
	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	:	1			
	the CCR management operations.			THE PARTY NAMED IN COLUMN TO THE PARTY NAMED		
COD TO		L	<u> </u>	L	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	ugifive 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			<del></del>		· .
	landfill access roads?	-			-	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			<u> </u>		
	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.	ŀ				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	<del>  </del>				
	complaints received during the reporting			•		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
	1 1088011			_		
<del>                                    </del>	,					
ldītional	.INOTES:					
<del></del>				<del></del>		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					

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

	Weather Conditions: 50	<u> </u>	<del></del>		<del></del>		
	<u> </u>	. Ye.	5	No		Notes	
CRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	8 <i>4</i> )					
1-	The same, straine, rotational movement or				T		
	localized settlement observed on the	-					
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			1/	1		
2	Were conditions observed within the cells	<del> </del>					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill						
	operations that represent a potential disruption		l		T		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?						
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	<u> </u>			<u></u>		
<b>~</b> -	within the general landfill operations that	ļ					
	represent a possibility of the Silver	İ		à			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of						
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>	<u>.                                    </u>			
RF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))					
4	Was CCR received during the reporting		T				
	period? If answer is no, no additional			, /			
	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						
	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		+		<del></del>	<del></del>	
	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.						
	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		<del> </del>				
0.				1			
0.	complaints received during the reporting		r .	1			
.0.	complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1	I			•