- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT Weather Conditions: _ · // l 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 CCR7 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. 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 landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the 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. 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?

Additional Notes:		
-		
	:	

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SEE LANSING LANDFILL

7_/_ - Z 4 T_____ h. A L Q 1

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? 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			. Yes	No	1.	Notes	
localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 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. CR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$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 suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wested) 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 fine 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	CRI		<u>.</u> 4)				
CCR? 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. CR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$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 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. 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	1_	localized settlement observed on the	-			•	
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. CR Fugitive 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 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. 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 petiod? If the answer is yes, answer question	-	CCR7		C			
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. CR Fugitive 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 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	2	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption					
within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CR Fugitive 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 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. 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		to ongoing CCR management operations?					
the CCR management operations. CR Fugitive 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 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	3.	within the general landfill operations that					
CR Fugitive 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 suppressants) 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		represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1	\top		
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? 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	יא שי		0)			-	
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. 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			[])				
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. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question					<i>\(\cdot \)</i>		
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question							
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	5.			+	-		
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-			
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 convol 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	6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	•				
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 convol measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question						,	
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question				1			
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question							
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question					l	•	
corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust convolusessures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			_	····	
Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			_		
measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question						-	
describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control					
O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		measures effective? If the answer is no,	1				
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		describe recommended changes below.	- 1	1			
period? If the answer is yes, answer question	0_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen					
period? If the answer is yes, answer question		complaints received during the reporting					
Were the citizen complaints logged?	_	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1			
John State of Spanish House of the Control of the C	[Were the citizen complaints logged?					_

QAWaste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015.xlsx

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

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 CCR7 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. 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 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. 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? II. Additional Notes:

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

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

Date:_	11- 20-24 Inspector	ر الح	Ah			
Time:_	Weather Conditions: -5 \	nny		-		
		. Yes	No	T	Notes	_
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	; 349				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		1	1		
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ:		1		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing					
	CCR?			1		
2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1	1			
	operations that represent a potential disruption	İ	i			
·	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		T			
	within the general landfill operations that	F	1			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of					
	the CCR management operations.					
المالي يوء	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(·(O)	<u>.l</u>			
4		(4))	1			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting		1 .1	<i>-</i> .		
l	period? If answer is no, no additional					
ļ	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	-			-	
	Iandfill access roads?					
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	1		•		
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe				_	ı
	corrective action measures below.					-
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	- 1	l			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1				
70	describe recommended changes below.					- 1
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-				ᅱ
	complaints received during the reporting	1	1			
7.7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	·			•	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					7
ddītional	, Notes -		-			_
						
						_
	·					-

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

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

12-24
Inspector

Inspector

Date:_	11-13-24 Inspector 1	A LAIN	AL		•	
Time:_	9:15 Weather Conditions: OV	'er cn	-5K			
		. Yes	No		Notes	_
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	349				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			T -		
	localized settlement observed on the	ľ		1		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1 ,	1		
	CCR7 .					
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	1				
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1 ,	 		
	operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		1			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	ļ	ļ			_
]	within the general landfill operations that	<u>i</u> -				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1 /	†		
	, ·					
<u></u>	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(<u>4))</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?		1 1			
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?		1			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					_
	landfill access roads?	ļ	_		-	i
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the					-
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	.	- 1			ı
	corrective action measures below.				•	
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	-				\dashv
	complaints received during the reporting					
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				-	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					1
	•					1
ditional l	Notes:	. <i>.</i>				

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

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT NSING-LANDEUL Weather Conditions: _ -Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or lo∝lized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR7 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 5. 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 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. 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?

Additional Notes:	. •

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Foun 10_2015-xls=