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

| Tīme: | Weather Conditions: | | | | |
|--------|---|----------|-----|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| | , seatter Conditions | | | | |
| | | Yes | No | | Notes |
| CRI | Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | 849 | | | 21022 |
| I_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | 1 | | | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | · - | | | • |
| - | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | 1 | | | |
| | CCR7 | . | 11 | | |
| 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | 1 | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | | 1- | , | |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 0 | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | [| | | |
| IR Fa | gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257-80(b)(| <u>~</u> | | | |
| 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | // | 7 | 7 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | | | 1 | |
| | 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 | • |
| | 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 | | | - | |
| i | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | | | - | |
| | corrective action measures below. | | | 1 | - |
| 9_ | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | |
| : | measures effective? If the answer is no | | | | |
| | describe recommended changes below. | 1 | | | |
| 0_ | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | | | | |
| | complaints received during the reporting | | | | |
| | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | 1 | | |
| L 7 | Were the citizen complaints logged? | - | | | |
| | | | | | |
| onal N | rotes . | - | | | |
| | | | | | |

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

WEERLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT 4-17-24 SEB LANSING LANDFILL

| | Inspector | | | | | | |
|---------|--|-------------|---------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--|
| Tīme | Weather Conditions: | | | | - | | |
| 1 | | Ye | 25 | No | 1. | Notes | |
| CCR | Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257-8 | 349 | | | | | |
| 1 | - Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or: | 7 | | | | | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | = | | | | • | |
| - | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | 1 | | 1 | 1. | | |
| | CCR? | | | | 1, . | | |
| - 2 | LA - A DETECTION OF SOLVER WITHIN HIS CRIES | | | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | _ | + | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 3. | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | | | 1 | | |
| ے۔ | The second of th | i. | - 1 | | | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | F | | | † | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | | - 1 | 1 | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | | ĺ | | |
| CRE | ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4 | <u> </u> | <u></u> | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| 4. | Was CCR received during the reporting | =5)) | | | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | | - 1 | 1 | • | | |
| | 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 | | | ĺ | | | |
| | 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. | • | | 1 | | • | |
| 9_ | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | + | | | | |
| | measures effective? If the answer is no | | | 1 | | | |
| | describe recommended changes below. | | 1 | | | | |
| IOL | Were CCR fugitive dust-related crizen | | +- | | | | |
| | complaints received during the reporting | | 1 | - 1 | | | |
| | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | | | | | |
| LI. | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| tional: | Notes: | | | | | | |
| | 5 . | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | • | |

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Fmal\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 =:ls=

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

| Date | Inspector | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Time | Weather Conditions: | | | | - | | |
| | , | | | | | | |
| | | Yes | | No | <u> </u> | Notes | |
| | Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | .849 | | | | | |
|] I | The subsection of the subsecti | i | | | | - | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | . [| - 1 | | 1 | | |
| - | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | $\cdot \mid$ | | | 1. | | |
| - 2 | The sometimes observed within the cens | | | | + | | |
| 1 | containing CCR or within the general landfill | • | - 1 | | | | |
| 1 | operations that represent a potential disruption | | - | | 1 | | |
| | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | - 1 | | 1 | | |
| 3_ | Were conditions observed within the cells or | - | | | | | |
| 1 | within the general landfill operations that | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | : | | | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | | | | |
| CCRI | ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)(| (4)) | | | <u></u> | | |
| 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? | | | - | | | ĺ |
| 6_ | If response to question 5 is no, was CCR | | 1 | | | | |
| | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | | | | | |
| | landfill working face, or was the CCR not | | | | | | ł |
| | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | | İ | | | 1 |
| 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 | | | 1 | - | | - 1 |
| · | corrective action measures below. | | 1 | | | - | - 1 |
| 9_ | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | | | |
| | measures effective? If the answer is no, | | | | | | |
| | describe recommended changes below. | | | | | | 1 |
| IO_ | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | - | | | | | |
| | complaints received during the reporting | | | | | | |
| 7 7 | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | | - 1 | | | _ |
| <u> </u> | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| litional. | Notes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | _ ; |

Q:\Waste Connections\Lensing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015_rlsz

WEERLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| Date:_ | Inspector | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------------|------------|-------------|--|-------|---|
| Time: | Weather Conditions: | | | | - | | |
| | , | | | | | | |
| | - | | <u>e</u> 5 | No | | Notes | |
| CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 525) | 7_849 | | | | | |
| I_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement o | xi [| | | T | - | |
| _ | localized settlement observed on the | [| | | | | |
| - | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR7 | · . | | / | † r . | | |
| - 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | - | | 1/ | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | :. | | | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | | | | Y | | |
| | 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 | æ | - 1 | 1 / | 1 | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | L | | |
| | gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) |)(4)) | | | | | |
| 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | | | | 7 . | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | | - 1 | i / | | | |
| | information required | | | | | | |
| 5_ | Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust | | 1 | | | | |
| | suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? | | | - | | | |
| 6_ | If it 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 | | | | | , | |
| 1 | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | | 1 | 1 | - | | |
| | corrective action measures below. | | | | | - | |
| 9. | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | | | |
| ŀ | measures effective? If the answer is no, | | | 1 | | | |
| .0. | describe recommended changes below. | | | | | | |
| | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | - | | | | | |
| 1 | complaints received during the reporting | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| <u> </u> | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | | | | | _ |
| <u> </u> | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | | |
| | • | | | | | | |
| ional N | Totes: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | | |

QAWaste Connections\Lensing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 = is=