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

Date:	1-17-202 Inspector: Weather Conditions: 27	the		
Time:_	Weather Conditions: 27		4:00	
		Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	<u>.</u> 1)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1	localized settlement observed on the	ľ		
.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			T <sub>i</sub>
	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		<del> </del>	
] ]-	within the general landfill operations that	<u>.</u>		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		. (//	
Ì	the CCR management operations.			
			l	<u> </u>
	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u>4))</u>		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		i /	
	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			
į	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			•
8.	landfill access roads?			
٥.	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		<u>-</u>	
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		<del></del>	•
<del></del>				
Additiona	7 Notes-			
	22.0002			

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

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

Date:^	7-27-21 Inspector 19	<u>IÙA</u>	1			
Time: 7'30 Weather Conditions: Cold						
		Yes	No	Notes		
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: <b>4</b> )				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or					
	localized settlement observed on the			İ		
1.	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		. /	Ti		
	CCR?					
. 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			<b>/</b>		
	operations that represent a potential disruption					
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?		<u> </u>			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or					
	within the general landfill operations that			Y		
1	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		i/			
	the CCR management operations.					
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		i/			
	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?					
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	1				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,					
10.	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?					
44.	11 et e me cruxen compiants logged/					
•						

Additional Notes:

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

Date:	3-7027 Inspector: W	Wan				
Time:	12:40 Weather Conditions: Su-	nn 1	cold	-		
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRL	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: <b>1</b> )				
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				•	
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ				
-	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?		<u>``</u>	1		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or					
	within the general landfill operations that	•				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		و			
	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	<u> </u>				
	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?	1			-	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		•	<del></del>		
	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.	1				
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?					-
	· '					

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

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL 1-10-2072

.me:_	3.05 Weather Conditions: Clou	41		•	
		Yes	No	Notes	
CRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	.: 4)	<del></del>		
1.	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?		-		
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.		レ		
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.		V		
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,				···
9.	· 1	ł	1		
10.	describe recommended changes below.  Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		·		

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

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

Date:	1-14-2020 Inspector.	AU L	<b>V</b>			
Time:	7-14-2020 Inspector. Sure 2:25 Weather Conditions: Su	ny	4	•		_
	,	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	ľ		İ		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1 / -	1		
	CCR?			1		
• 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells					
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill					
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1 <i>L</i>			
ļ	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i			_	
	within the general landfill operations that					
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		· . /			
1	the CCR management operations.					
CCR Fo	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))	·	·		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting					
1	period? If answer is no, no additional		i /			
	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?	1			•	
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.	1	-			
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?					
	. '					
Additiona	l Notes:					