WEERLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SEB BANSING LANDEILL

16-25
Inspector

Inspector

10-26-25

| Date | : 11-26-25 Inspector Inspector | SINGLA | NDFILL | | LUIV KEPORT | |
|-------------|---|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----|
| - Time | Inspector Weather Conditions | hadl | LAN | ۔ | | |
| | , | | | | | _ |
| | | _ Yes | No | 1. | Notes | |
| CCR | Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 525) | 7_849 | | | | |
| 1 | Was buiging, sliding Totational movement of | I. | | | | |
| | localized settlement observed on the | Ī | | 1 | - | |
| | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | | | <u></u> | | |
| - 2 | | - | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general lander | r | | | | |
| 1 | operations that represent a notential discussion | | | 1 | | |
| | 100 ongoing CCR management operations? | " | | 1 | | 1 |
| 3. | Were conditions observed within the cells or | | | - | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | ļ:- | | 1 | | 1 |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | f | | | | j |
| | the CCR management operations. | | 1/ | 1 | | - 1 |
| CCR F | | <u> </u> | | | | - |
| 4. | ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | <u>)(4))</u> | | | | |
| | Was CCR received during the reporting | / | 1 | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional information required | | 1 | 1 | | - 1 |
| 5. | Was all CCD and assistant | | | 1 | | } |
| | Was all CCR conditioned (by wearing or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? | , / | † - | | | |
| 6_ | Hresponse to question 5 is no, was CCR | <i>V</i> | | | | |
| 1 | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | | | | |
| | 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? | | . 7 | | | |
| 8_ | Was CCR fuertive dust observed arets | | <i>V</i> . | | - | - 1 |
| | landilly if the answer is ves describe | | ا | - | | |
| | corrective action measures below | . 1 | i/ | | _ | - 1 |
| 9_ | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | | |
| | measures effective? Tribe and and | 1 | | | | - |
| | describe recommended changes below | | 1 | | | |
| 10_ | WEIE COR FRONTING ANGELIA TOTAL | | | | | 1 |
| | complaints received during the reserved | 1 | 1/ | | | |
| | Printed II the answer is the angular manner | | | | | - 1 |
| | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 7 |
| ddītīonal l | Notes: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | T | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------------|--|---------------|--------------|---|--|
| ران | Table 1 Table 1 | - Yes | | No | <u> </u> | | otes_ |
| L | Landill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | .849 | | | | | |
| سام | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the | · [| | | | | territoria de la constantida del constantida de la constantida del constantida de la |
| | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | ſ | | | | | |
| | CCR? | | | سا | Tr. | | |
| 2. | The conditions observed within the call | | | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | 1 | | - |
| | operations that represent a potential discussion | | - 1 | | | | |
| | to ongoing CCR management operations? | 1 | 1 | | l | | |
| 3. | Were conditions observed within the cells or | | | - | | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | ļ:- | - | | | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | | 1 | | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | | | | |
| <u>ع</u> روب | | <u></u> | | | | | • |
| <u> </u> | agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(| <u>(4))</u> | | | | | |
| 4_ | was CCR received during the reporting | | T | | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | | | , 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 | | } | - 1 | | | |
| | landfill working face, or was the CCR not | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | 1 | ł | | | |
| 7_ | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | | | | | | |
| | randim access roads? | | | 1 | | | - |
| 8. | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | | | | | | |
| | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | . 1 | | | - | | |
| 9 | corrective action measures below. | | | | | - | |
| | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | | | |
| | measures effective? If the answer is no, | | | - 1 | | | |
| D_ | describe recommended changes below. | 1 | | - 1 | | | |
| - | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | - + | | | | | |
| | complaints received during the reporting | 1 | | - 1 | | | |
| | Dentons II me answellis des ansmer des | | | 1 | | | |
| | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | | |

Q:\Waste Connections\Tansing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10, 2015

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKELANSING LANDFILL Inspector WAS WAR

| Datez | SRP-LANS Inspector | Mg (| CIL | FOLL | | | - | |
|-----------|---|-----------------|-----|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------|--------|
| Tīme | 1/-/0 - Z5 Inspector V |)unr | 15 | | - | | | |
| | | . Y | | No | T | | Votes | |
| CCRI | Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257 | 8/0 | | | | | .10263 | |
| 1_ | Was buiging, sliding, rotational movement or | -0- <u>-</u> 5) | | | | | | |
| 1 | localized settlement observed on the | · - | 1 | | | - | | |
| - ' | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | ı | | | 7. | | | |
| <u> </u> | ICCR? | - | - 1 | - | 1' | | | |
| - 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | | | ··· | - | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | - 1 | . / | - | | | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | 1 | | | | t | | |
| | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | - 1 | • | 1 | | | |
| ٥. | Were conditions observed within the cells or | | | | 1 | | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | ļ ^r | | | 1 | | | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | = | | 1/ | T | | | |
| | the CCR management operations. | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| CRF | ngiive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | (0) | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| 4. | Was CCR received during the reporting | (4)) | | | | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | 1 | | | / . | | | |
| | information required | | - { | . / | | | | |
| 5_ | Was all Company | | | | | | | |
| ~- | Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust | | | | | | | |
| 6 | suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? | | | - | | | | |
| 0 | 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 | | | | |
| 7_ | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | - | - 1 | | | | |
| /_ | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on | | _ | | | | | |
| 8_ | randini access roads? | | 1 | | | | - | |
| 0_ | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | | | | | | | _ |
| | landfill? If the answer is yes, describe | - | 1 | | - | | | |
| 9_ | corrective action measures below. | | 1 | | | - | | |
| | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | T | - | | | | |
| 1 | measures effective? If the answer is no, | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 10_ | describe recommended changes below. | | 1 | - 1 | | | | |
| -0- | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | - | | | | | | |
|]; | complaints received during the reporting | | | | | | | |
| <u> -</u> | Periods II the answer is yes, answer question | | 1 | | - | | | |
| | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | | | | - | |
| | | | | | | | | \neg |
| N IEROM | Totes | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SEPTANSING LANDFILL Weather Conditions: OVM CNS 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 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. 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 フ_ Iandfill 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 IO_ complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged? II_

Additional Notes