WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SEB-LANSING LANDEUL

Datei	1-30-25 Inspector	hell)c						
Time: 9:10 Weather Conditions: 0 V ~ C15 75										
Γ		<u>Yes</u>		No		Notes				
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84)										
1 1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				7					
	localized settlement observed on the	F	- [
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1	1	11 -					
- 2	CCR7	-			+					
	Were conditions observed within the cells									
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	İ								
.	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	- 1	سنن	1					
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or									
]	rvere conditions observed within the cells or	į.		•						
1	within the general landfill operations that	f	-							
1	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	f j	- 1							
	the CCR management operations.									
CCRF	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(41)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	(-))								
	period? If answer is no, no additional		- 1							
	information required	1		1						
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	 								
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-	-						
6_	Hresponse to question 5 is no, was CCR	 								
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1		}						
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	Ì	1	}		•				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1	1						
7_	Was CCD - The court 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		<u> </u>			•				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		ĺ							
	describe recommended changes below.		ĺ	1						
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen									
	complaints received during the reporting	- j		T						
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	ļ		}						
II.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				-	_				
	Combrantiz Togged					-				
7.25.5.	-									
idītional Notes:										
	• ····································									

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

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 Iocalized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 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? 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 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 9_ 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? 11. Additional Notes:

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Inspector _ Weather Conditions: - OVLV 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 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. 5. 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 landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

Q:\Waste Connections\Tansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015=1==

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKRIDANSING LANDELL

Inspector 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 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? Were conditions observed within the cells or 3. 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? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on Iandfill 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 Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes:

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015x1s=

- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:	7-2-25 Inspector 1/2		DAN		-	
Time	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,) F :	Jun.			
	-	. Yes	No		Notes	
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	R/19				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	. 1		-		
}	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ	1	1	-	
_	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1	}			
	CCR?	1	1 6	1		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	j	1	j		
İ	operations that represent a potential discontion	1	1 6	 		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	1		7		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	-				
ļ	within the general landfill operations that	<u>[:</u> -	ł	1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		,	1_		
1	the CCR management operations.	ĺ		1		
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(<u>4</u>))				
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting		1			
	period? If answer is no, no additional		//	1 .		
	information required		1			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		 	<u></u>		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-	ł		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		 			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		ı			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		1			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		ļ			1
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					ſ
	landfill access roads?				-	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the					1
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		l			
	corrective action measures below.	.			_	- 1
_و	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				-	1
	measures effective? If the answer is no.	1	1			
	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	- 1				}
11.	Were the effect of the second		1	•		- 1
	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
						
ditional	Notes					
				-		

Q:\Waste Connections\Tansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015.xlsz