· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: 1-29-25 Inspector Date: 1-29-25	
Time: 9:30 Weather Conditions: Buhn	

			<del></del>			
	-	. Yes	No	_  .	Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	.84)				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		L	,	-	
- 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				
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.	Ē		-		
CCRF	agitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))				
<u>4.</u>	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?	8	-			
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?	V				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		V		-	
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		/			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
						- 1

Additional Notes	. •	
<del></del>	•	
-		
	<u></u>	
	-	<u>-</u>

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

Date:_	1-27-25 Inspector	ك لأ	)ay		-	
Time:_	10:20 Weather Conditions: VS	244 6	old b	sebu-	0	_
		Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	: 849				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or		<u> </u>			
	localized settlement observed on the	·  -			-	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1	1 1	1.		
	CCR7	.	1	Ι'		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			.		
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	1			
<u> </u>	to ongoing CCR management operations?			1		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	ļ i.				
	within the general landfill operations that	ŀ		·		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	<b>₹</b>	1.0			
	the CCR management operations.				,	
CCRF	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(40)				
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	1	Т			
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1 .		
	information required					
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		<del></del>	<del> </del>		
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?		-			
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	<del></del>	<del> </del>	<del> </del>		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1	1	,	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		十	1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		<del> </del>	<del> </del>		
	landfill access roads?		11/		•	1
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del>                                     </del>	-		
	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	. /	<b>-</b>	1		ļ
	describe recommended changes below.	·//				ŀ
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			<u> </u>		
	complaints received during the reporting	-				Ì
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	ſ		_		- 1
II.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		$\overline{}$			
ditional	Notes:					
		-		<del></del>		

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	1-15-25 Inspector.	NG LAI	ANT.		-	
Time:_	7:45 Weather Conditions: - V	219	(00)			
<del></del>	•	Yes	No	1.	Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	349				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	. 1				
	localized settlement observed on the	į.	ĺ		•	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1		
-	CCR?	1		1		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	<del> </del>				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1				
	operations that converge a series I amorti	1	1	1		
	operations that represent a potential disruption	]				
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?	ļ				
٥.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	ļ.				
	within the general landfill operations that	F	ļ			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	1	1 1/	1		
	the CCR management operations.	j	1	1		
תנה ציי	with Dark Tampation ( 40 Clean Corn cons)			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
4	ugifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(	4))				
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting		1 /			
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1		
<del></del>	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			<del></del>		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		1 1			- 1
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		[			- [
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		<del></del>			- 1
	landfill access roads?				•	$\neg \neg$
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the					
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1 1	-		$\neg$
	corrective action measures below.	•	1 1			- 1
9_					-	1
7-	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		1 1			$\dashv$
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		1			
7.0	describe recommended changes below.					
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-				
ĺ	complaints received during the reporting					
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		j			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				-	
	•					
ditional l	Notes					
				<del></del>		
	:					

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

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CKR \$257.86)  1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR management operations?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells 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 sefety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fuggitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during fis reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by weating or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?  6. Fit response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (weated) 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 composition of the second complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question lit. Were the citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question lit.	Date:_	1-8-25 Inspector.	MA C	NOFILL		•	
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84)  1. Was bulging, shiding, rotational movement or 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?  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 Fugfitive 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 succeptable 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  Mistonal Notes:			-22 m			,	
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or 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?  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 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 weating 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 control complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		·	,	No	1.	Notes	-
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing periadons 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?  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 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 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 connective 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 control period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257 R					
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.  CCR 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 (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 figitive 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 figitive dust-celated citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Was bulging sliding rotational movement or	<del>-)</del>				
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.  CCR 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 (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 the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive dust-clated ditizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		localized settlement observed on the	-	}		•	
CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells' containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to engoing 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 Regitive 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 wening 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 flugitive dust generation?  7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  8. Was CCR figitive 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 figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1			
containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to engoing 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 Rugitive 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	-	CCR?		11/	7'		
containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to engoing 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 Rugitive 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 (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to flugitive 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	- 2	Were conditions observed within the collection			<del></del>		
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))  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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	[	1	1		
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))  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 figuitive 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 figitive dust related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Operations that represent a potential discussion			1		
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))  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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	1	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Rugitive 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? 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	3.	Were conditions observed within the college					
represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR 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 (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 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?		within the general landfill operations that	<u>:</u> -	-			
the CCR management operations.  CCR 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 westing or dust suppresents) 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 the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		represent a notantial discounting operations that	-	1	_1		
CCR 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		the CCD			]		
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 frigitive 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 critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the critizen complaints logged?		the CCR management operations.					
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 frigitive 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 critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the critizen complaints logged?	CCRF	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	Đ)				
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Was CCR received during the reporting					
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		period? If answer is no no additional		1 /	1 ·		
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?					l		
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 flugitive 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?							
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		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 conective 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	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 conrective 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to				•	
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		landfill working face, or was the CCR not					
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1			
Iandfill 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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	7.						
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		landfill access roads?				•	
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		-			
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		landfill? If the answer is ves. describe		1	-		- 1
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  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		corrective action measures below.	•			•	
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?	9_			<del> </del>			
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?		measures effective? If the answeriano		1 1			
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		describe recommended changes below					ļ
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	IO_	Were CCR figuritive dust related and					
period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		complaints received drain a the arms	-	1			
II. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Deriod? If the appropriate the reporting					
iditional Notes:	77	Were the citizen court is yes, answer question				_	.
		Were me cruzen compraints logged?					$\dashv$
	iditional	Notes-					
		:					

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Incremen Feet 10 0000

## WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	1-2-25	SKB I	DWG W	EILL And		-
Time:_	10:05	_Weather Conditions:	Whenst	-	-	
			Yes	λΤα	T	)T (

	•			-		-
	•	. Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	.849				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	. 1	T			
i i	localized settlement observed on the	-	[		-	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			J.		
	CCR?	.	1 1:/	<b>-</b>  '		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells			_		
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	Í		1		
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	1 1/			
L	to ongoing CCR management operations?	1				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		<del></del>	-		
	within the general landfill operations that	į.				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	F	1 4	1		
	the CCR management operations.	1		1		
					· · ·	
CCRE	ugifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)	( <u>4</u> ))				
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			7		
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1		
	information required	į		1		
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		<del> </del>	<del> </del>		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1	1		
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	ł	1	1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					- 1
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					}
	landfill access roads?		1	l	-	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		<del></del>			İ
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			-		
	corrective action measures below.	•	1			- 1
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		<del> </del>			-
	measures effective? If the answer is no.		1			
	describe recommended changes below.					- 1
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen					
	complaints received during the reporting	•	1 7			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question					
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				_	_
	1 oto die cidzen compisints logged?					
						ı

Additional Notes:	. •	
	:	
	=	 
	-	