WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

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 at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	Date:_	inspector	idt		_	-
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.86) 1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 2. Were conditions observed within the cells' containing CCR or within the general lendfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general lendfill 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 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 frigitive dust sugeration? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust control period? If the answer is yes, answer question in the complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question.	Time:	3:30 Weather Conditions: - 3	46		DVn	cust
CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) 1. Was building, 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 suppressurs) 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 succeptable to fugitive dust suggestation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fligitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures refrective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fligitive dust control measures refrective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?				No		Notes
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 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-clated citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257 &	 49			
localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? 2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR runargement 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 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 geriod? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	1_	Was building, sliding, rotational movement or	7			
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 meanagement 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 CKR \$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 comtol 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?		localized settlement observed on the	F	-		-
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. CCR. Rugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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 control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR, fugitive dust-related critzen compilaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the critzen complaints logged?		sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		- ا	1	
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 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 deliviery 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 chizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		CCR?	1	1	- '	
operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? 3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR £257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
15. Mere 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 CKR \$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 figitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		containing CCR or within the general landfill		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 figitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR figitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		operations that represent a potential disruption			1	
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 figitive dust observed at the 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 fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		to ongoing CCR management operations?		1	1	
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 suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wested) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	ے۔	were conditions observed within the cells or			1	
file CCR management operations. CCR Frigitive 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 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		within the general landfill operations that	•			
file CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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		represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1 (_	1	
CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) 4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		the CCR management operations.			1	
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 reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	CRF	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CER 8257 8005)				· .
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. 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?	4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	:))	1		
information required. 5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 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 contective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Defind? If answer is no no additional		1	1 -	
S. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to frigitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related critzen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the critzen complaints logged?		information required				
suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	5_	Was all CCR conditioned (by the conditioned of the				
6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		suppresents) prior to deliver to leading or dust		-	1	
conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	6_	If response to describe 5 = 10 and 11/2		ļ		
Indifill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation? 7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		conditioned (Tretted) Tiens, was CCR		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 corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		landill morphy these services are selected bitton to manapoint to				•
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		Suscentable to firming ace, of was the CCR not				
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		TW COD				
8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	7_	was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	-	Two CCD 5	}			•
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 dusting the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	0_	landation text of the		}		
Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		corrective action — a substitute describe	. }	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 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	9_	ATE CUTTED CCD 5		ſ		•
describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		The surface of the surface dust control				
Were CCR frigitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question II. Were the citizen complaints logged?		describe recommendation of	1			
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question II. Were the citizen complaints logged?	70	Were CCB = 115		1		
Penou? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	1	complaint to see a distrelated citizen	-			
Wese the citizen complaints logged?	.	period? Ferbanance the reporting		1		
Wese the citizen complaints logged?	77	Word to the answer is yes, answer question	1		•	
TYONG? N.T.		were the citizen complaints logged?				-
Trong? N						
THOUSE TABLES	inonsl I	Votes				

QalWaste Connections/Lansing/CCR Plan Final/Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 along

	WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION F	ESIDUA	ד. (כבר) זו	7CDIE: C7		
Date:_	Inspector	COL	DEILL		TOTA KIRKOKI.	
Time:	1 0 2 Meather Conditions 5	7° W	ingla			_
		. Yes	No		Notes	
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257	T_8 <u>4</u> 9				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement o	r·l		\neg		
	localized settlement observed on the	F	1 . ,	i	-	
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1		∫ .		
	CCR7	-		1'		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill	[]	}	\mathcal{X}		
	operations that represent a potential disruption	n l	1 /			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?	- 1				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			-		
	within the general landfill operations that	<u>[</u> -	1			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety o	.f		\vee		
	the CCR management operations.	-1		1		
רית שי				L		
CCICSI	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))				
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	j				
	period? If answer is no, no additional					
	information required					
5_	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust					
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?	1	-			
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	† · · · · ·	 			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1	1 1		•	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		i i			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1	, ,			
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on	 				
	Iandfill access roads?	1	1 1		-	
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	ļ				- }
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	1		-		\neg
	corrective action measures below.		١ ١			
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				•	- 1
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		7			
	describe recommended changes below.	1	1			- 1
IO_	Were CCP for officer and a second					
	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	- 1				
ļ	complaints received during the reporting	1				
II.	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	1			
	Were the citizen complaints logged?					
	-					

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

WEEKLY COAL-COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT Time: 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 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? 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 fügiüve dust control 9_

Additional Notes:	

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?

10_

II.

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT Yes Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sīdeslopes or upper deck of cells containing Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations. CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.80(b)(4)) Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill? 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 8_ 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. 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

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

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SERLANSINGLANDENLI Weather Conditions: Yes No Notes CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.84) 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. 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? 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 9_ measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. IO_ Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged? Additional Notes