WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Date: 1-21-2027 Inspector University Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

DateA	mspector.	, - M		
Time:	5.15 Weather Conditions: U	Och P	20	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	adfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		
. .	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1/	Υ _ι
	CCR?			
· 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		,	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		i/	
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 Fug	pitive 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	onditioned (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?		ν .	
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?			

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015xlsx

Additional Notes:

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

Date: 214 - 272 Inspector:								
Time: 10:09 Weather Conditions: Cold								
		Yes	No	Notes				
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: 4)						
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-				
1	localized settlement observed on the	İ						
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		i	1				
. 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells							
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		/					
ĺ	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			1				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.							
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>					
CCRF	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							
<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	/	İ					
	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							
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		·/	-				
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control							
٦.	measures effective? If the answer is no.							
	describe recommended changes below.	1/						
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		-					
10-	complaints received during the reporting	[
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question							
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		-,/	-				
	1086011							
Additiona	Notes-							
randings	I Notes:							

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

ING 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? Were conditions observed within the cells or 3. 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? 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. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen 10. complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

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

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

ime:	1-31-2022 Inspector: Weather Conditions: Wo	M	Ca	(6.
		Yes	No	Notes
CR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: !)		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•
	localized settlement observed on the	•		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		B/	1
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		/	1
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1	1
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		ļ	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			<u>.</u>
	within the general landfill operations that		/	T
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			ĺ
	the CCR management operations.			
CR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
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			
	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?			