WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKB DANSING LANDFILL Weather Conditions: _ 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. 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? 11.

Additional Notes:	
	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
-	
	: ~

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

Date:	10-1-21 Inspector: 1 M	d War		
Time:	8:00 Weather Conditions:	louly		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
	localized settlement observed on the			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		<i>i</i> /	l t
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
1	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 Fr	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		/	
]	period? If answer is no, no additional		V	
	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			
<u> </u>	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			•
8.	landfill access roads?			
٥.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	ł	ì	-
	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	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	1	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			•
	. '			
Additiona	l Notes:	• •		

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

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

		Yes	No		Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 1)			
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	:		1	
	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?				
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.				
CR F	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	·	J	
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?	. V			
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?	V			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		V.		_
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		V	•	-
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?				

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

Weather Conditions: 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 Were conditions observed within the cells 2 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? 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? 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
SKB LANSING LANDFILL

Date:	10-27-21 Inspector	dh_		•
Time:_	1:30 Weather Conditions: -OU	non	st	58
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	.: (4)		
I.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ		
1.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			[]r
. 2	CCR?			
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells		Ţ	
ļ	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			
J-	within the general landfill operations that	ļ.	ļ	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.		i	
ļ		<u> </u>		<u> </u>
	agitive 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?	V		
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			
7-	measures effective? If the answer is no.			
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting	j	/	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		_/	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -			
•	. '			

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015_xlsx

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

Inspector: Weather Conditions: ____ 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? 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR 6. 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:

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

Date:	1147-21 Inspector Marc	1W~		
Time:	8.15 Weather Conditions:	(001		30
	·	Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)		
l-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
-	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?			
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.		i/	
CCR Fu	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?	i/		
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.	i	-	
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 SKB-LANSING LANDFILL

Inspector. Weather Conditions: ____ 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? 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. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 5. 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? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the 8. 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? 11. Additional Notes:

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

Date:	11-21-21 Inspector.					
Time:_	10.00 Weather Conditions: 5 6	nny	<u> </u>	wd:	38	
	·	Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 49)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			Ţ	*	
	localized settlement observed on the	-				
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	[i/	Ti .		
	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	<u></u>	 		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1	within the general landfill operations that	į				
}	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		./			
	the CCR management operations.					
GCT T			<u> </u>		·	
	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	4))	T			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting					
	period? If answer is no, no additional		[[/			
ļ	information required.				•	•
5_	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		-			
6.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?					
0-	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					
0.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			-		
1	corrective action measures below.		Ì		•	
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	-				
	complaints received during the reporting					
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					_
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
A dditions	I Notes: Alas las	<i>1</i> *	*			