Date: 2-24-19	Inspector: Inspector:	
Time: 12 45 Weat	other Conditions: Suny	
7		

	7		·	•
	-	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)		
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			-
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ:		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		jA.	
	CCR?	1		
. 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
l	containing CCR or within the general landfill		,,,,,,,,,,	
	operations that represent a potential disruption	,	200	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		•	, ·
	within the general landfill operations that	!	أنسير و	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
CCRF	gitive 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			
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			
	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	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			•

Additional Notes:	. •	•
	:	
-		
	:	•

		Yes	No	Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: £)		
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•
	localized settlement observed on the	F		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			[
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		/	<i>k</i>
	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			
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Ft	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	<del>4</del> ))		7
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		3 /	
	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.		ļ	•
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	ļ		
	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?			

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

ime:_	SOS Weather Conditions:	<u>"(01-</u>	1	· 00	
		Yes	No	Notes	
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.8	: 4)			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			•	
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ.			
•	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			T	
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	l.	' '		
	within the general landfill operations that	<b>[</b>	İ		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1 . /		
	the CCR management operations.				
CR Ft	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			and the second s	
	period? If answer is no, no additional			and the second s	
	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	Ī			

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

Date:	77-3-		_Inspector:		RELL C	PAN 2	
Time:			er Conditions:	~ ~ ~	nn	9	
					Yes	No	Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity	Inspecti	on (ner 40 C	FR 8257 84	)		

	1	1		
	·	Yes	No	Notes
CCRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	: <b>1</b> )		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		T	
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		) p	
1	CCR?		1	
· 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?		1 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.			
CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	 4))	·	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	<del></del>		
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1	
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		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
/-	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	<del></del>		
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			·
	1			

Additional Notes:	. •	
	:	
-	:	-