WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

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 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 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 Ż. 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 IO. 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.xls=

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	10-14-24 Inspector Inspector	META	Way		-
Time:_	10-14-24 Inspector. 7:18 Weather Conditions:	11:3	5	WI	ol:
		Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.	8 <u>4</u> )			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	.			
ļ	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ			
1 -	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1	-
<u></u>	CCR7 .			·	
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
ĺ	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption	• [	- C	1	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?  Were conditions observed within the cells or	<del> </del>			
1 -		į.		_	
ŀ	within the general landfill operations that	_			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				·
CCRF	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)	<b>(</b> 4))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	T			
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1 0	1	
	information required	}			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			<del></del>	
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	ŀ	-		
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		ĺ	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	···········	<del> </del>	1	
	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.				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	complaints received during the reporting				
7 7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				_
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
	•				
Iditional	Notes:				
· · · · · · · · ·				<del></del>	

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

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SEBJANSING LANDFILL

Date:_	10-9-74 Inspector (1)	1 Wa				
Time:_	7:37 Weather Conditions: Sun	4	Pry	-		
	·	. Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257-8	: 49				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť			<del>-</del>	
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ				
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	ĺ				
	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	F	}			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			1		
	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	gifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)(	<u> </u>		-J		
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting		T	T		
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1/	1		
	information required					
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			<del> </del>		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-			
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			<del> </del>		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to					
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not					
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		<del> </del>			
	landfill access roads?		1		•	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		<del> </del>			
	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 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?					
litional	Notes:					
				<del></del>		

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10\_2015 x1sz

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKE ANSING LANDEUL

Date:_	10-2-24 Inspector OM	E Wa					
Time:_	e: 10:07 Weather Conditions: Sunn						
		Yes	No		Notes		
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: 4)					
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<u> </u>		T	•		
	localized settlement observed on the	F		1			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			1			
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells						
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1				
	operations that represent a potential disruption		, ,				
·	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		$\mathcal{V}$				
	the CCR management operations.				•		
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	<u>(1)</u>					
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			/			
}	period? If answer is no, no additional			•			
	information required.			- C.			
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		1				
	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	-	<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,	1	J				
	describe recommended changes below.		1				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-					
	complaints received during the reporting						
11.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				_		
77-	Were the citizen complaints logged?						
<i>3.</i> 35.5							
dditional :	TAOTEST						
	<u> </u>						

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inches