| Inspector. J. J. J. Weather Conditions: Weather Conditions: Weather Conditions: 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 | Yes Yes | No No | <u>.</u> I. | Notes | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Weather Conditions: | Yes Yes | No No | <u>.</u> - | Notes | |
| Mas 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 | Yes Yes | No | <u>.</u> | Notes | |
| Mas 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 | -849 -849 | No |]. | Notes | |
| 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 | -849 -849 | I No | 1. | Notes | |
| 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 | .849 | | 1 | | |
| 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 | = | | | | |
| sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | - | |
| CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | | |
| Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill | - 1 | 1 (| 1 | | |
| containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | | |
| Leongaming Cont or writing me Sellerar Januarit | 1 | | | | |
| operations that represent a potential disruption | . | , , | | | |
| to ourgoing CCP management operations? | 1 | | 1 | | |
| Were conditions absorred with the | | | <u>. </u> | - <u> </u> | |
| | į- | | | | |
| within the general landing operations that | _[| | | | |
| represent a potential disruption of the safety of | t | | | | |
| the CCR management operations. | | | | • | |
| tive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | <u>(4)</u>) | | | | |
| Was CCR received during the reporting | Ť | | T | | |
| period? If answer is no, no additional | | . / | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? | | - | | | |
| | | | | | |
| conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | | | • | |
| landfill working face, or was the CCR not | 1 1 | | | | |
| susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | 1 1 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| andfill access roads? | i | - 1 | | - | |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| andfill? If the answer is ves. describe | 1 | l | • | | |
| orrective action measures below. | . | | | - | |
| | | | | | |
| neasures effective? If the answer is no. | 1 | 1 | | | |
| escribe recommended changes below. | 1 | | | | |
| Vere CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | | | | | |
| omplaints received during the reporting | İ | 1 | | | |
| eriod? If the answer is yes, answer question | | 1 | | | |
| ere the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Tar | | | | | |
|) LCS_ | | | | | |
| | 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. Tive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)) 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to andfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on andfill access roads? Vas CCR fugitive dust observed at the andfill? If the answer is yes, describe | 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. Sive 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to andfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on andfill access roads? Vas CCR fugitive dust observed at the endfill? If the answer is yes, describe or control teasures effective? If the answer is no, escribe recommended changes below. Vere CCR fugitive dust-related citizen implaints received during the reporting fined? If the answer is yes, answer question ere the citizen complaints logged? | 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. Sive 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to andfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on andfill access roads? Vas CCR fugitive dust observed at the sudfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. The current CCR fugitive dust control teasures effective? If the answer is no, escribe recommended changes below. Vere CCR fugitive dust-related citizen amplaints received during the reporting stiod? If the answer is yes, answer question ere the citizen complaints logged? | 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. Sive 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to andfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to frigitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on andfill access roads? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the midfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. The current CCR fugitive dust control teasures effective? If the answer is no, ascribe recommended changes below. The current ccr fugitive dust-related citizen miplaints received during the reporting find? If the answer is yes, answer question ere the citizen complaints logged? | 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. five 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? If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to andfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on andfill access roads? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the scale or on andfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. The current CCR fugitive dust control teasures effective? If the answer is no, escribe recommended changes below. The current control dust related citizen implaints received during the reporting thod? If the answer is yes, answer question ere the citizen complaints logged? |

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

| Date:_ | 8.05 Weather Conditions S | 900 | <u> </u> | | | |
|-----------|--|--------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|
| Time:_ | 8.05 Weather Conditions: - 5 | sung | 5 | <u> </u> | | - |
| | | . Yes | No | T | Notes | |
| CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257. | 8 <u>4</u>) | | | - | |
| 1_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | | 1 | T | - | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | F | | | | |
| <u> </u> | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? | | 1 2 | | | |
| - 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | | | | 7-10 | |
| 1 | containing CCR or within the general landfill | 1 | 1 1 - | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | - [| | | | |
| 3. | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | | | | |
| 3- | Were conditions observed within the cells or | į. | | | | |
| } | within the general landfill operations that | _ | | | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | | | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | | | |
| CCRF | igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)) | <u>(4))</u> | | | | |
| 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | Ţ: <u>.</u> | | | | |
| | 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? | | 1 | | | |
| 7_ | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | | | | <u> </u> | |
| | landfill access roads? | | | | | |
| 8_ | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | Ţ | | - | | |
| | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. | .] | 1 | | | |
| 9. | | | | | - | |
| 9- | Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no. | | l | | | |
| | describe recommended changes below. | | | | | |
| 10. | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | | | | | |
| ±0- | complaints received during the reporting | - | | | | |
| | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | | | | |
| 11. | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | . |
| | To other complaints togged? | | | | | \neg |
| 2.25.2 | NY | - | | | | |
| lditional | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

_ Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) 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 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 7_ 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. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen 10_ complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? Addītīonal Notes:

| Date:_ | 4-7-25 Inspector | m d C | JA L | | • | |
|------------|--|--------------|-------|---------------|----------|--|
| Time:_ | $\frac{2}{3}$, 21 Weather Conditions: ω | ind, | cool | | | |
| | | . Yes | No | | Notes | |
| CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | 8 <u>4</u>) | | | | |
| 1_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | . | | | - | |
| } | localized settlement observed on the | ľ | 1 | | | |
| | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | | 11 - | | | |
| - 2 | CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells | | 1 | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | . 1 | | | | |
| | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | | 1 ` | | |
| 3. | Were conditions observed within the cells or | + | | - | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | į:- | | | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | - | , | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | ` | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | | · | |
| | ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | (4)) | | | | |
| 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | | | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | İ | 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 | 1 | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | |
| 8_ | landfill access roads? | | | | | |
| ٥. | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | | | - | | |
| | corrective action measures below. | • | 1 | | <u>.</u> | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 11. | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | |
| | 1055011 | | | | | |
| (dfrons) : | , No | | | | | |
| ldītional | TAOTEZ | | , | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

| | SKBLANS | ESLUUAL | (CCR) IN | SPECI | ION REPORT | |
|-----------|---|---------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Date: | 3-31-25 Inspector | | OBILL OB | | - | |
| 2244 | | 760 | | / | | |
| Time: | 12.47 Wearher Conditions: S | unn | 58 | - | | |
| | 7 | | | | | |
| | | . Yes' | No | 1 | Notes | |
| CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257. | .8 <u>4</u>) | | | | |
| 1_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | | 1 | T | _ | |
| İ | localized settlement observed on the | ŀ | | _ | | |
| | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | 1 | 11/ | 1 | | |
| | CCR? | | 10 | | | |
| - 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | j | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | } | | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | 1 | 1/ | 1 | | |
| 3_ | to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or | | | | | |
| 1 2- | within the general landfill operations that | į. | ļ | | | |
| | | _[| | | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | F} | | 1 | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | <u> </u> | | | | |
| CCRF | igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | (4)) | | | | |
| 4. | Was CCR received during the reporting | | | | | |
| | 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 | 1 1 | | | • | |
| 1 | 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? | | | | • | İ |
| 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, | 1 | | | | |
| 10_ | describe recommended changes below. | | | | | |
| 10- | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | - | | | | |
| | complaints received during the reporting | | 1 | | | |
| 77 | period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | | | | _ |
| 11. | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | |
| | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| ddītional | Notes: | | | | | |