WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	6-25-25 Inspector_	MATAL	Welli		-
Time:	Inspector	0-{	Beel	r vin	well
	-	<u>Yes</u>	No		Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257				
1_	Was buiging, sliding, rotational movement or	<u>c </u>	1		
ì	localized settlement observed on the	F			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		11/	⁷ 1	
- 2	CCR?	-			
	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill	1			
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	٦			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			-	
	within the general landfill operations that	į.			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	_	1		
	the CCR management operations.	-		4	
	rgitive 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			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	ļ	1 1		•
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1	1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
-	Iandfill access roads?		l J		•
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,		T		
	describe recommended changes below.	}			
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting	-	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	1		
II.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
litional l	Notes	_			
			-		
					

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

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

The Section (per 40 CER \$257.84) 1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper feeck of cells comzaining 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 one 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. 2. Fingitive 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 access roads? 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 yet, 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 measures effective? If the answer is yet, discribe corrective action measures below. 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	R. Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.86) 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 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. R. Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR meetived 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? Was CCR figitive dust control measures below. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR figitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yea, sawer omestion period? If the answer is yea, sawer omestion complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yea, sawer omestion	Date:_	b-11-25 Inspector.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	~ .	•
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CHR \$257.84) 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. 2. Refugitive 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 weing or dust suppressurs) 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 figitive 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. 0. Were CCR figitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	In Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) 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 uponing 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. R. Fugifive 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 weating 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	Cime:	8 15 Weather Conditions:	loal	<u> </u>	<u>10-4</u>	10.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. 2. Registry 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 access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the enswer 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received dinting the reporting period? If the answer is yee, answer meastron	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 that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. R. Fugifive 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?			<u>Yes</u>	No		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 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. 2. Registry 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 access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the enswer 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received dinting the reporting period? If the answer is yee, answer meastron	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 that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. R. Fugifive 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	8 <u>4</u>)			
ilocalized 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. 2. Regitive 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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yee, answer question	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. R. Kugifive Drist 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	l_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	.			
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. 22. Regifive 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer meetion	CCR? 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. R 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 wening 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		localized settlement observed on the	-	ļ		
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. 2. 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 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? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. R. 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 wening or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? Elfresponse 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1		<u> </u>	
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. 2. R. 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer measures processing period? If the answer is yes, answer measures processing period? If the answer is yes, answer measures to the same and the period of the answer is yes, answer measures.	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. R. 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 westing 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. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?					7	
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. 2. R. 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer mention	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. R. 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? 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 crizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	2					
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. CR 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. S. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppressnts) 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 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. 0. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. R. Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$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? Effresponse 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		containing CCR or within the general landfill			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. 2. 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 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 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. 0. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. R. 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 weining 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		operations that represent a potential disruption	.	1 -	1 -	
within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CR. 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? 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. R. 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 (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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		to ongoing CCR management operations?			1	
represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. R. 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 suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. R 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 (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. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	-		-	
ithe CCR management operations. R. 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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	the CCR management operations. R 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 suppresents) prior to delivery to landful? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landful working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landful access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landful? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		within the general landfill operations that	F		1	
ithe CCR management operations. R. 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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	the CCR management operations. R 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 suppresents) prior to delivery to landful? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landful working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landful access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landful? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		represent a potential disruption of the safety of	:	1	1	
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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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? 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		the CCR management operations.		1		
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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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? 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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	CR Fu	gifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b))	(41)		1	·
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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	1	T	T	
imformation 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		period? If answer is no no additional		1	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 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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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? 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 critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the critizen complaints logged?		information required	1	i,	/	
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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? 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 crizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the critizen complaints logged?	-5					
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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. 9. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		ampresents) prior to deligious to land series		-	Į	
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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? 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 critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the critizen complaints logged?	-	The market is a series of the				
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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? 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	0_	conditioned (manual)		ł	1	
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 confective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	susceptable to fugitive dust generation? Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		lender (wetted) prior to transport to		1	l	•
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		radium working race, or was the CCR not		ĺ		
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	landfill 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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?						
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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	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. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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 complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?			j	i		-
corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	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 critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	.		-	
measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		corrective action measures below.		ı		-
describe recommended changes below. 0. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	- 1	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	ļ	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1	1		
O. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?		describe recommended changes below.				
period? If the answer is yes, answer onestion	period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	0_]	Were CCR fugitive dust-related critical				
period? If the answer is yes, answer onestion	period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?	ľ	complaints received during the reporting	1			
Were the citizen complaints logged?	Were the citizen complaints logged?		period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1	•	
	·	I-	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
	nal Notes:						

Connections Lansing CCR Plan Final Weekly Inspection Form 10, 2015

- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SEP LANSING LANDEUL

Date:_		SA	len		
Time:	12'12 Weather Conditions: - 1	Tat	2.	· 	
	<u> </u>	Yes	No	1.	Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257	-849		<u>'</u>	
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of	r Í			
	localized settlement observed on the	ŀ	1	ı	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			\ ',	
- 2	CCR7 Were conditions observed within the cells	-			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	.			
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	L	- 1		
1	to ongoing CCR management operations?	"		1	
3_	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that	į-	1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety o	اً ـ			
	the CCP management and the safety of	T			
	the CCR management operations.				
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b))(4))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional		, ,	<i>X</i> ·	
	information required.	1			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	<u> </u>		 	
	suppresants) 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	1	}	1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1	ŀ	
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			ļ	
	landfill access roads?		1	1	-
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		 	ļ	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1	-	
	corrective action measures below.	•	1		•
٩_	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				
	complaints received during the reporting				
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			•	
II.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				-
					-
ditional i	Notes:				

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

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SEBAANSINGLANDELL

Date:	6-3-25 Inspector (VM				-	
Time:	Weather Conditions: - 5	uhny		-		_
		Yes	No	1.	Notes	
COR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	849				
1_		- 7	-1			
Ì	localized settlement observed on the	· -	1	1	•	
	sīdeslopes or upper deck of cells containing		Ja.			
	CCR?	.		7'		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1				
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	L				
<u> </u>	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or					
1	within the general landfill operations that	ļ.				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	=				
j	the CCR management operations.	-				
-		L				
	ugitive 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		
	information required.					
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	 		 		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	1	-			
6_	Hiesponse to question 5 is no, was CCR	-		 		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		İ	ļ		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					
7-	landfill access roads?		1		-	
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		 			
0-	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1	-		
	corrective action measures below.]		_	
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		-			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		1			
	describe recommended changes below.		[
10_	Were CCP for its and changes below.					
101	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-				
	complaints received during the reporting					}
7.7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1	-		
	Were the citizen complaints logged?				-	
ldītīonal	Notest	. •				
····				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
						_

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Datez	$\frac{5-2^{11-25}}{7:03}$ Inspectors $\frac{1}{2}$ Weather Conditions: $\frac{1}{2}$	de	An.		
Time:_	7:03 Weather Conditions: DU	LICK	+1	<u>.</u>	
		. Yes	No		Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	.8 <u>4</u>)			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	.]		T	<u> </u>
1	localized settlement observed on the	ľ	ł		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			1	
<u> </u>	CCR?				
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells		1		
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1		
Í	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	10	1	
3.	to ongoing CCR management operations?	 			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	į.		1	
	within the general landfill operations that	<u> </u>	1 1	T	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	[]		ĺ	
	the CCR management operations.				
CCRF	agitive 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 1/	<i>Y</i> .	
	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	1	1 1		
	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		1	•	
	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	1		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				•
ldītional	Notes:	. •			
				 	

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT ansing Landfill Weather Conditions: 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 CCR7 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 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 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. _و 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? Additional Notes:

	•
	•
	•
	. =
•	
	· -
	•
= -	•

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT ansing landfill Weather Conditions: 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 CCR7 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 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. 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 II. Were the citizen complaints logged?

	•
Additional Notes:	- ·
	<u>:</u>
	_ :
	•

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	5-6-35 Inspector Inspector	mglai ~~{		ILL Yuu		•	
Time:_	Weather Conditions: Su	my			-		·
		. Yes		No	1.	Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	849					
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	· [1	-	
1	localized settlement observed on the	Ì			 		
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1			ı		
<u></u>	CCR?						
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells						
l	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1	- 1	_			
	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	ŀ					
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			Î			
	the CCR management operations.						
		<u></u>					
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))					
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting				, ·		
	period? If answer is no, no additional	1) /	/		
	information required.	[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	•					
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1	1		•	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		1				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		ł	1			
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		1				
	Izndfill access roads?		_				
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				-		
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe						- 1
9.	conective action measures below.					-	-
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control						
	measures effective? If the answer is no,						j
10_	describe recommended changes below.						}
101	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?						-
	of o the critisen compraints logged?						$\overline{}$
lditional	Notes:		_				
					•		

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