WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB KANSING LANDFILL Inspector licain Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257-84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing Were conditions observed within the cells 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. 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 Iandfill access roads? 8_ Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.

Treathough TAOLES!	
	•
	
•	

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

Were the citizen complaints logged?

9_

IO.

II.

A ###

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SEPTANSING LANDEILL

V)-17-23
Trepertor

Trepertor

Date:_	10-17-23 Inspector ()	متكلا	24	-V1 x	、		•
Time:_	10:45 Wearther Conditions: - C	Dun	<u>- C</u>	ust	m	5/7	
		Ye	5	No	<u> </u>	Notes	
CCRI	Candfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	.84)					
I.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	1		T	7	_	
	localized settlement observed on the	<u> </u>					
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			í	ł.		
	CCR7 .	.			' '		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					-	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	•	- 1				
ŀ	operations that represent a potential disruption	1		-	1		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?						
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				1		
]	within the general landfill operations that	!	- 1				
l	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	€	- 1	. /	1		
	the CCR management operations.	.]					
CCRF	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(<u>4</u>))			<u></u>		
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	Ť	T				
	period? If answer is no, no additional				<i>-</i>		
	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	1	- 1				
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not						
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			i			
7-	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		-				
7-	landfill access roads?			ļ		•	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		\dashv				
0-	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			1	-		
	corrective action measures below.	•	1	l		-	
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?		-				-
	of the outsett combiguities rogged.						
	•						
dirional	Notes:						
	:						

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 > 15=

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKB LANSING LANDFILL Weather Conditions: Yes Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84) 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 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 firgitive dust generation? 7_ Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on Iandfill access roads? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the 8_ landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. و_ Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. IO_ Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question II. 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

Inspector_ Weather Conditions: _ Yes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257-84) 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? 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 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. 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 II. Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Forth 10_2015 xls.