WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKB KANSING LANDFILL

Date: 3-27-24 Inspector White With

Time: 12:47 Weather Conditions: - Z Cloud.

Yes No Notes

	•				
		. Yes	-	No	. Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257-84	<u>.</u>			
I_	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			<u></u>	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4)))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional			$r \downarrow$	
	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			- 1	
	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				-
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		}	1	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		<u> </u>		-
	measures effective? If the answer is no,				
	describe recommended changes below.	1			
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
1	complaints received during the reporting	1			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				
LI_	Were the citizen complaints logged?				

Additional Notes:		
	-	
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Weather Conditions: Yes Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257-84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or i 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? 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 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? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on Ž., 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. 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? Addītīonal Notes:

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015-215-

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT								
Date	Inspector Inspector	mshu	\supset \sim					
· ~	7.07	f		. (-				
111116	Weather Conditions: C	000		<u> 5. C</u>				
	•							
		Yes	No		Notes			
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 525.	7.84)						
] I.	The second of th	ıri			•			
	localized settlement observed on the	[1				
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	`.		1 .				
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells							
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	Ţ ·						
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	mi l		1				
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			1				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			-				
1	within the general landfill operations that	ļ-		1				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	œ.	1					
	the CCR management operations.							
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b))(40)			-			
4	Was CCR received during the reporting	1(=))		1				
	period? If answer is no, no additional	1	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	1	1		•	- 1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1 1			- 1		
7_						- 1		
/_	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.							
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				_	-[
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		- 1					
	describe recommended changes below.	1	1			1		
IO.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen					1		
	complaints received during the reporting	-	1			$\overline{}$		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1					
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?					-		
ittional Notes:								

Q:\Waste Connections\Tensing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015=15=

- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKE KANSING LANDEUL

Date	3-7-7° Inspector	Mil	, la			-	
Time	= 3.05 Weather Conditions: - 4	JAR	m	47	-		
			Yes	No		Notes	-
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 525)	7_849				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1_	. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement o	Ξij.		T			
1	localized settlement observed on the					•	
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR7	• .		16	₹.		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells						
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	.					
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	n		1	1 .		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	_			1		
3_	Were conditions observed within the cells or			 	-		
	within the general landfill operations that	<u> </u> -		1	1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	<u>-</u>			/		
	the CCR management operations.	1			1		
		ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ					
CCRF	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4)					
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting				1		
	period? If answer is no, no additional	}			-		
	information required.		- 1				
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	1					
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1	1				
7		ļ			_		
)_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?			ı			
8_							
0-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				-	,	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		.	1			j
9_						•	_
J-	Are current CCR fugitive dust control						$\neg \neg$
	measures effective? If the answer is no,			1			1
10_	describe recommended changes below.						
1,01	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		{
	complaints received during the reporting			1			1
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		- 1	1			
II.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		7			<u>_</u>	\dashv
ditional l	Notes:						
	£						

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