- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKBLANSINGLANDFILL Inspector Weather Conditions: 8:05 <u> Yes</u> Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or Iocalized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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 comtol measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen IO_ complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged? II_ Addītional Notes:

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| | Inspector_ \ | ングァ | DEILL | | - |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------|
| Time:_ | 8-19-25 Inspector Weather Conditions - + c | 2599 | } | - | |
| | | Yes | No | , . | Notes |
| CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257 | .849 | | | |
| I_ | Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or | · Í | | | |
| l | localized settlement observed on the | = | 1 | | • |
| - | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | | | | |
| | CCR? | . | | | |
| - 2 | Were conditions observed within the cells | | | | |
| | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | j | 1 | |
| | operations that represent a potential disruption | | 1 | | |
| | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | 1/ | | |
| 3_ | Were conditions observed within the cells or | 1 | | | |
| | within the general landfill operations that | - | | 1 | |
| | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | - | 1 | 1 | |
| | the CCR management operations. | | | - | |
| CCR F1 | gifive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(h)) | ـــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ | | | • |
| 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | 1 | | | |
| | period? If answer is no, no additional | | | <i>\ \</i> | |
| | 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 | | 1 | 1 | • |
| | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | } | | |
| 7_ | Was CCP STREET TO | | | 1 | |
| | Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? | | | | - |
| 8_ | Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the | | | - | |
| H | landill? If the answer is ves describe | | | 1 - | |
| | corrective action measures below. | | | 1 | - |
| 9_ | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | | | |
| - | measures effective? If the answer is no | 1 | | 1 | |
| | describe recommended changes below | 1 | | 1 | |
| TOT I | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | | | | |
| 10 | complaints received during the re- | 1 | | 1 | |
| (ك | SELLOUZ IF the answer is ves answer answer. | 1 | | 1 . | |
| 11. 7 | Were the citizen complaints logged? | | | ļ | |
| | | | | | |
| idonal N | rotes . | | | | |

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT
SKBLANSING LANDFILL

Inspector. Weather Conditions: - () Yes 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 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 5. 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 Iandfill access roads? Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen IO_ complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged? II_ Additional Notes

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

| Date: \$\frac{1.4.25}{1000}\$ Inspector | Date:_ | 8-4-25 Inspector | hard | ti | S. | | <u>-</u> |
|--|--------|---|--|--------------|-----|-----|----------|
| CCR 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 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 weating 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 fingitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR figitive dust observed arthe landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR figitive 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 no, answer is received during the reporting period? If the answer is no answer is no answer is were answer is more answer is no | Time:_ | 12:10 Weather Conditions: -St | inm | | Ma | A - | _ |
| 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 comaining 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 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 enswer is no, no additional information required 5. 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 fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust compol 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 sex, answer meeting | | | , | | No | T | 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 comaining 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 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 enswer is no, no additional information required 5. 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 fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust compol 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 sex, answer meeting | CCRI | andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257. | 8 4) | | | | |
| 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 wetning 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 figitive dust observed arthe 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 meetion. | 1_ | Was builging, sliding, rotational movement or | | | | | |
| 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. 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 observed in the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer meetion. | | localized settlement observed on the | F | ſ | | | |
| 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 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 citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question period? If the answer is yes, answer question to the period of the period of the answer is yes, answer question. | | sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing | | | ſ | | |
| 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 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? 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-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question period? If the answer is yes, answer question. | | | | | | | |
| 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 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 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 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 mention | - 2 | were conditions observed within the cells | | | | | |
| 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 Sugitive 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. Hresponse 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 mention | | containing CCR or within the general landfill | | | | 1 | |
| 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 (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 arthe 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 | | operations that represent a potential disruption | L | | , | | |
| 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 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 | | to ongoing CCR management operations? | | | | 1 | |
| 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 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 | ے۔ | were conditions observed within the cells or | ļ. | | | | |
| fine 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? 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 measures | | within the general landfill operations that | ŀ | - } | | 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 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 | | represent a potential disruption of the safety of | : | | | | |
| 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 | | the CCR management operations. | 1 | - | | T | |
| 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 | CRF | gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b) | (<u>4</u>)) | | | -l | |
| 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 | 4_ | Was CCR received during the reporting | } | Т | | 1. | |
| 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 | | period? If answer is no, no additional | | - } | . / | · · | |
| 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 mession | | information required | 1 | | | | |
| 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. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer mestion | 5. | | | | | ļ | |
| 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 citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? | ĺ | - 1 | - | | |
| conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | 6_ | If response to question 5 is no. was CCR | | | | | |
| 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 | | conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to | | ł | | | |
| 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 | | 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 | | susceptable to fugitive dust generation? | | | | | |
| 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 | 7_ | Was CCR spillage observed at the and | | - | | | |
| 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 | | landfill access made? | | | | | • |
| 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 | 8_ | | | +- | | | |
| 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 | | landfill? If the answer is ves describe | | | | - | |
| 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 | | corrective action measures below | • | 1 | - 1 | | |
| 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 | | Are current CCR fugitive dust control | | + | | | |
| describe recommended changes below. 10. 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 | | 1 | - 1 | | |
| 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | describe recommended changes below | | | - 1 | | |
| complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question | 10_ | Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen | | - | | | |
| period? If the answer is yes, answer question | | complaints received during the reporting | | 1 | - 1 | | |
| 11. Were the citizen complaints logged? | | period? If the answer is ver another marries | | 1 | - 1 | | |
| The state of the s | 11. | Were the citizen complaints larged? | | | | | - |
| | | | | 1 | | | |

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