	-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	-	1 2	ſi.		
	- 2	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	m				
	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.	of				
	CCRF	ugitive 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 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 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

Additional Notes:	
<u> </u>	

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

Date:	Z-Zl Inspector In			Elle			-
Tīme	: 10:17 Weather Conditions: Giam		48				
		Ye	:5	No	7	7\7	ot'es
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257	- F			<u></u>		0123
I.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	-04)		*********			
	localized settlement observed on the	-; -			1	-	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			C	1.		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells .		-				
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	.		•			
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	ai l			7		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		- 1		1		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				上	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	within the general landfill operations that	-	-		1		
1	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	Ε					
	the CCR management operations.			`			
CCRF	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>					
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	1			<u> </u>		
	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					-	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not						
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1	1			
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			1	-	,	
	corrective action measures below.	•				-	1
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		+				
	measures effective? If the answer is no.		1				
	describe recommended changes below_						1
IO_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-	_				
	complaints received during the reporting						
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1				1
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?						-
ditional l	Notes:	- •					
	\$ ar						

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SKE LANGING LANDEUL 2-14-24 Inspector. Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or i localized 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? 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 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? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on 7_ 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. IO. 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?

Additional Notes:		
-		
	_	

- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date	IUSPECIUL_ +V	えじ		مادلك			•
Time	Z'.05 Weather Conditions: - C	100	t,	2"	7-		
	-	Ye	<u>ح</u>	No		Notes	
CCR.	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 525)	7_849		_			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of	חדו	\neg				
1	localized settlement observed on the		I			•	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?				1.		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells		-+			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1	containing CCR or within the general landfil	· .	- 1				
1	operations that represent a potential disruptio	۲.			1		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	╨			1		
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or						
	or conditions observed within the cells or	į.	- 1				
	within the general landfill operations that	F		_	\perp		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	of		V			
	the CCR management operations.						
عر على	notive Dart Tomosfor (40 com rass and				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
4.	ugitive 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						
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?	1		-			
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						
	Iandfill access roads?			- 1		-	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the						
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe				-		
	corrective action measures below.		1	- 1		-	1
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		 				
	measures effective? If the answer is no			- 1			- 1
	describe recommended changes below.		1				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		├				
ŀ	complaints received during the reporting						
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			1			1
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?						-
	and a state of companies to get of the companies to ge	1					
	•						
dītional l	Notes:						
	:						

Q:\Waste Connections\Tansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 = 15=

	• .	J			.=			
	WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION R	ESIDITA	3 T. CC	עב לכנושה				
WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT								
Date:	- 1-31-24 Inspector ()			ماليماليا		-		
بالمادر	Inspector	t W					ì	
Tīme	9:04 Weather Conditions: - /	9	\(\sigma^{\gamma}\)	•				
	Weatter Conditions		$\supset 1$	unn				
	\				-,			
γ	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ye.	5	No	1.	Notes		
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	849					-	
I.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	.0- <u>-</u>)						
	localized settlement observed on the	•				•		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	•	- 1	<i>i</i> ~				
-	CCR7	•	- 1		1			
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells	' 	_		ļ			
	CONTRIBUTE COMMENTED TO COMMENTED THE COMMENT OF TH			/	1			
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	.]		,/	1			
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	L			ł			
<u></u>	to ongoing CCR management operations?				1			
3_	Were conditions observed within the cells or							
ĺ	within the general landfill operations that	F			1			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	-	- 1	1/				
	the CCR management operations.							
		<u> </u>						
CCRE	ugifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER §257-80(b)	<u>(4))</u>						
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	} 			/			
	period? If answer is no, no additional		- 1	. /	-		1	
	information required.	1	- 1				1	
<u>-</u>			_				- -	
٦.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wening or dust			_				
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?		- 1					
6_	If iesponse to question 5 is no, was CCR	•						
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		- 1	- 1				
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not						1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1				1	
7_							1 -	
<i>,</i> -	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		1		_	<u>-</u>		
8_				_				
0_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1		-			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1	1				
	corrective action measures below.		1			=		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		1					
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		1					
	describe recommended changes below.		1	- 1				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen							
	complaints received during the reporting		I	- 1				
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			1				
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?					-	. 1	
	or or or or combiguits to Eded X							
litional:	Notes:							
	5					_		
							— ,	
							:	
			-					

Q:\Waste Connections\Lensing\CCR Flan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 =:ls=