.e:	Weather Conditions:	Yes	No	Notes
D.T.	adfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84))	•	
Lan	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the		_/	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	CCR?			<u> </u>
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.			
		(A))		
	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b))	(-))		No Kinh ASH
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional	1		No Can 10
	information required.	1		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
٦,	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	\ <u></u>		
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?	<u> </u>		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on	1		
	landfill access roads?			,
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	1	'	1
	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	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
1.1.				
	onal Notes:			

:	12:30 Weather Conditions: 39	Yes	No	Notes
	T 40 (non 40 CFR 8257.84)			
	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	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		1 1	
	within the general landfill operations that		\times	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		16.00
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			NO KING ASH
	period? If answer is no, no additional			ASH
	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	-	1	
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1		1
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	 		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on	1		
	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	1		
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,		1	
	describe recommended changes below.			
10	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
10.	complaints received during the reporting		.	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			
TT.	MOTO IITO OTINGOTI AOTIDAMENTE SO		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	

	SKB ROSEMOONT INDUST [2-[8-20] Inspector: /design of the conditions: 32°	Yes	No	Notes
	169 T 4 '4 Legaction (per 40 CFR \$257.84)			
	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the		,	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1×1	
	CCR?		1	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
•	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		1 1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		'`	
	the CCR management operations.			
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))	1	1 . ACH
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	ĺ		NO KING ASH
	period? If answer is no, no additional		1 × 1	
	information required.		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.			
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
TO.	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

	12-11-22 Inspector: Jew 3 Weather Conditions: 3	Yes	No	Notes
	40 CON SOFT 94)			
R Lan	dfill 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		(\	
2.	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		(\	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
J.	within the general landfill operations that			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
D Fin	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
7.	period? If answer is no, no additional		X	
	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?	<u> </u>		
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	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			
	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
11.	were the citizen complaints logged?			

	12-4-26 Inspector: Head 2:36 Weather Conditions: 426	Yes	No	Notes	
	40 CED 8257 84)		<u> </u>		
	dfill 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		X		
	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?		X		
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.		X		
	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional		X	NONE	KING
5.	information required. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
٥,	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?				

e:	10-40 Inspector: His 34°	Yes	No	Notes
			210	
R Lan	dfill 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		3/	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		X	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.	(4)		
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)((4)) T	Т	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	1	1	NONE
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1-01-0
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	1	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 fugitive dust generation?	-		
77	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
7.	landfill access roads?	_		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
٥،	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		-	1
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	1		
2,	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting	1	1	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

	// de -> Inspector: /dy // '15 Weather Conditions: 35°	Yes	No	Notes
Lone	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	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		\mathbf{V}	
	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		\times	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
R Fug	ritive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	1	1	
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X	1	
	information required.	/ \		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	1		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			•
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	X		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	<u> </u>		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X	
	landfill access roads?			
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		./	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.	 	<u> </u>	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	1	1	
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X	ļ	
	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	-		NONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	<u> </u>		

	. [Yes	No	Notes
R Lan	dfill 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		X	
	CCR?		/ \	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		X	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		Y	
	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		X	
	the CCR management operations.		/ \	
CR For	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
••	period? If answer is no, no additional	\checkmark		
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	LX_		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	`		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	10		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		\perp	
	landfill access roads?		+	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1 1	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
٧,	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1		
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		$+$ \times $+$	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		()	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		×	NONE
			,	
	aal Notes:			

•	Weather Conditions: 69	Yes	No	Notes
	. 1		IVO	
R Land	fill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		T T	
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
	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		1 × 1	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
		(1))		1
R Fug	itive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	l X		
	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	1		1
•	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?		<u> </u>	
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		į	
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X		
	describe recommended changes below.		-	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		IX	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		-	NONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			100106

-	10-30-20 Inspector: Heath	Yes	No	Notes
	41 (1111-00-01
	Hill 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			
۷.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		' '	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		X	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>	
CR Fug	itive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	1 1	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	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	X		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	(
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		~	
7.	landfill access roads?			
8,	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1	
٥,	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.		()	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
7,	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1 1		
	describe recommended changes below.	(
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		1 ~/	
	complaints received during the reporting	1		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?			NONE
				1 /0//06

	12:40 Weather Conditions: Coo	Yes	No	Notes
	7000 T (1 1 1 2 4 1 1 2 4 1 CED 8257 84)	2.00	L	A Allegania
	Hill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		T	
	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	1	eX	
	CCR?		(\	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
٥,	containing CCR or within the general landfill		×	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		0	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		`	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
R Fug	itive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	V		
	information required.	$\overline{}$		
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	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		-	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X	
	landfill access roads?	-	1 .	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		111	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		X	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no,	· ·		
	describe recommended changes below.	X		
10	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
10.	complaints received during the reporting		X	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	l	, ,	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		×	NONE
rr.	III OTO HID OTHERW ASSETS			

	10-16-28 Inspector: 144 10-41 Weather Conditions: 65°	Yes	No	Notes
D. T	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
K Lar	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	CCR?		0	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	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.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.	- ()	-	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	$-\Delta$		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	,		*
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	V		
*	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		-	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		l v	
	landfill access roads?		$+ \wedge -$	
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	1		
	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
	describe recommended changes below.	-		***
10.	Were CCR fugifive dust-related citizen		. ×	
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	-		NONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	J	X	

	10-9-20 Inspector: 49 11:00 Weather Conditions: 75	Yes	No	Notes
D I on	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the	1		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	CCR?		0	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		V	
	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		X	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		0	
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.	0 \		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	~		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		<u> </u>	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		}	•
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	7		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X	
	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		1	
	measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.			
	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			
	Were the citizen complaints logged?		1	NONE
11.	Were the chizen complaints logged:			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

	9:30 Weather Conditions: 45	Yes	No	Notes	
D. Lan	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				
1.	localized settlement observed on the				
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		$ \times $		
	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		X		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		0		
	the CCR management operations.				•
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X			
	information required.	()			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V	1		
	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		Ì		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X		
	landfill access roads?	 	1		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1 ./		
	corrective action measures below.		X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	$ $ \times			
	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
10.	complaints received during the reporting		1 ×		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question				
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NON	E
1.1.	, ,				

	7-25-20 Inspector: / feat	Yes	No	Notes
	40 CER 2357 9A)			
	Ifill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	1		
	localized settlement observed on the		N	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			
2.	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
۷.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		V	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
J.	within the general landfill operations that		/	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
TO The	itive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
	Was CCR received during the reporting			
4.	period? If answer is no, no additional	No]	
	information required.	X]	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	,		
۵.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
0.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1		
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
	landfill access roads?		$\perp \Delta$	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	1	1	
01	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	1		
	corrective action measures below.	<u> </u>		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X		
	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		(21.20
	Were the citizen complaints logged?	- L		NONE

	7-18-20 Inspector: See 4500 Weather Conditions: 75	Yes	No	Notes
	40 CDD 2457 94)			
	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		1	
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the		^	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		\propto	
	CCR?		Υ \	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
۵.	containing CCR or within the general landfill		. 1	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X I	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>	
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
5.	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.	0		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	~		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	I X		
б.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			,
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		1 1	
	landfill access roads?		1/	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		\ X	
	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,	17		
	describe recommended changes below.	1		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting		1	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE
11.	Mere the criticen combiantes toggers.			

	4'00 Weather Conditions:	Yes	No	Notes
R Lan	dfill 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		X	
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		,	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		. V	
	operations that represent a potential disruption			
	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or			
3.	within the general landfill operations that			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
		(1)	<u>, </u>	
	ritive 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.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
٥,	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6,	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
0.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	Х		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
	landfill access roads?		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
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,	X		
	describe recommended changes below.	-		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		X	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1 (1	NONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			NONE

		Yes	No	Notes
R La	ndfill 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		X	
	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		X	
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		1	
	period? If answer is no, no additional	~		
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V		
	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	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
	landfill access roads?		A	·
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	 		NA ANK
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	PUFF

		Yes	No	Notes
) I or	ndfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	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		Y	
	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		X	
	the CCR management operations.		, ,	
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.	(
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V	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 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,	l X	1	
	describe recommended changes below.	/		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		V	
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		1	2/22/5
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			MONE

.,	. [Yes	No	Notes
) I on	adfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	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		,X	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		1 1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		'	
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>	
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	T	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	1		
	period? If answer is no, no additional			
	information required.	/	-	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	\mathbf{X}		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			•
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	X		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1		,
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1	-	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X	
	landfill access roads?		-	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1 >	
	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	
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	1		
	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	No Conflair
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		1/	No Corryllan

	8-14-20 Inspector: Heath Real Weather Conditions: 87°	Yes	No	Notes
Lon	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	<u>, was a fa</u>		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing	ĺ	X	
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		l	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		N /	•
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		N	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	г т	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			•
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		KING ASH
	information required.	/		
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	Ì		•
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1		
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	X	1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X	
	landfill access roads?	<u> </u>	 	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		X	
	corrective action measures below.	 		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10	describe recommended changes below.	, ,		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting		1.00	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			NONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	 		
11.	Mere the citizen combiguity toggen.			

		Yes	No	Notes
R La	ndfill 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		X	
	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			
٥.	within the general landfill operations that			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		X	
	the CCR management operations.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	<u> </u>		
	period? If answer is no, no additional	1		Wast And
	information required.	X		KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	. /		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	X		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	. ,	<u> </u>	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
	landfill access roads?		$+\lambda$	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1 ']	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.	1	X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control		- ()	
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	/		
	describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	, ,	1	
20,	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	ļ		MONE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
		J		
	aal Notes:			

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

	SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUS	TRIAL V	VASTE FA	CILITY	^
Date:	7-3(-20 Inspector: H	7			
Time:	10			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		Yes	No	Notes	
CCR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	l)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		X		
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.		X		
CCR Fu	gitive 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.	X			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
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?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X		
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.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		×	NONE	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				

Additional Notes:		

	Y'00 Weather Conditions: 78°	Yes	No	Notes
	1001 T			
	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	<u>' </u>		
1.	localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
2.	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?		· K	
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.		K	
CR F	ugitive 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.	X		KING ASA
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	NONE
11.				

e:		Yes	No	Notes
D. T.	169 T. 4			
1.	Mas bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		V	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	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.			
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			11 10 1
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		KING ASH
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	X	1	
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		İ	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		 	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
۶.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X		
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
~~,	complaints received during the reporting		X	NONE
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		•	None
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			
	nal Notes:			

	7-10-20 Inspector: Akath 9:15 Weather Conditions: 67°	Yes	No	Notes
R La	ndfill 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		X	
2.	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?		K	
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.		X	·
CR F	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		<u> </u>
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	a	<u> </u>	
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?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		6	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
11.			X	HONE

:	Weather Conditions: 85°	Yes	No	Notes
	(A. CTID. 6457 9A)	105		
R Lane	dfill 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? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		0	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
J.	within the general landfill operations that		X	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
D For	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	())		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
т.	period? If answer is no, no additional	V		KING
	information required.	Δ		1900
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V		
	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		8	
	landfill access roads?		10	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1 6	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no,	1 X	1	
	describe recommended changes below.	1	`	
4.0	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		V	
10.	complaints received during the reporting		(
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	10	`	
11.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			NONE
11.	11 000 1100			
	onal Notes:			

e:	(-3ω Weather Conditions: 7κ°	Yes	No	Notes
	(1 (40 CFD 8257 84)			
	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)	T		
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		8	
	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to operations?		X	
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.		X	
CD E	ngitive 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.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
11	1 1 1 10		X	NONE

·	SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTR 5-19 Inspector: Lead 6:30 Weather Conditions: 70°	Yes	No	Notes	
		263	110		
R Land	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the		X		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		0\		
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		X		
	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.		X		
	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))			_
R Fug	Was CCR received during the reporting				
4.	period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X			-
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
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?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X		_
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	1	
11.	1 1 1 1 49		IX	NONE	

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	·	7:03 Weather Conditions: 67°	Yes	No	Notes
I. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of 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. 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 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		40 CED \$257 84)	100		
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. 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	Land	fill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 9257.047)	T		
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. 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? 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	i.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of			
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? 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. Refugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR 8257.80(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 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		localized settlement observed on the		X	
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. 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	Ì	sideslopes or upper deck of cons community			
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 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 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		CCR?			
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 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	2.	Were conditions observed within the general landfill	1	V	
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 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 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		containing CCR of Within the government a potential disruption	ļ		
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 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? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. Mare 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		loperations that represent a potential special consists CCP management operations?			
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? 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 of			
represent a potential disruption of the sarety 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? 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	3.	within the general landfill operations that		X	
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. 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		whilm the general disruption of the safety of			\$
## Projective 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		the CCR management operations.			
4. Was CCR received during the reputing 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		40 CFR 8257 80(b)(4	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 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		gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.65(5))	-77		Δ.
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	4.	Was CCR received during me reporting	V	1	KING ASH
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	X		
suppresants) prior to delivery to landfil? 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		information required.			
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	5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wearing of the	X		
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		suppresants) prior to derivery to minutes			
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	6.	If response to question 5 is no, was contained to	×	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		conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			1
7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads? 8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below. 9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	•	landful working face, of was the contraction?		1	
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 fugilive dust generalized or on			
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	7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale of on	1	1 X	
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 roads?	 		
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.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	1	X	
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 yes, 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		corrective action measures below.	-		
describe recommended changes below. 10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	V		
10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		measures effective? If the allower is no,			
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		describe recommended changes below.	-		
period? If the answer is yes, answer question	10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related criticen		. 1	
period? If the answer is yes, answer question 11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		complaints received during the reporting		1 %	
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?		period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	NONE
	11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

e:	Weather Conditions: 75°	Yes	No	Notes
		Tes	240	
R Lan	dfill 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?		X	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?		1	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	
CR Fu	gitive 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.	X		KING ASH
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
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		X	NG ALT
11.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		X	NONE

ne:	7:30 Am Weather Conditions: 56°				
		Yes	No	Notes	
'R Lan	dfill 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		X		
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to oppoing 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.		X		
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		KING	
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
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?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		K		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		· X		
11.	1 1 10		X	No	

	7:00/m Weather Conditions: 44/6	Yes	No	No	tes
D. Y	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
Lan	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				
1.	localized settlement observed on the		~/		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		$\backslash X$		
	CCR?				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		·V'		
	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		l X		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.		1		
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))	T		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		1		Λ .
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		King	A56+
	information required.				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V			
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?				
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	X			
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	10			
	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		X		
	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.	1 X			
	describe recommended changes see	1			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting		·V	1	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X		
11	11 11 1 19		X	Nor	JE
11.	Mete me curven combining 1988				

1. What is a second of the sec	Vas bulging, sliding, rotational movement or ocalized settlement observed on the ideslopes or upper deck of cells containing 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? Were conditions observed within the cells or		X	
1. What is a second of the sec	Vas bulging, sliding, rotational movement or ocalized settlement observed on the ideslopes or upper deck of cells containing 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? Were conditions observed within the cells or		X	
2. V	ocalized settlement observed on the ideslopes or upper deck of cells containing 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? Were conditions observed within the cells or		X	
2. V	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		X	
2. V	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		/	
2. V	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		V	
3. T	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		V	
3.	operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or			
3. T	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	11. 4611 emperations that			
1	within the general landfill operations that		X	
1	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		V \	
	the CCR management operations.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
CR Engit	tive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	())		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
1	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		KING ASH
	information required.	1		(eti o tiori
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	X		
	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	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
	landfill access roads?		X	<u> </u>
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	}		i
0.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		X	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	1		
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X	累	
	describe recommended changes below.	, ,		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		X	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			A.E. 4.C.
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			NONE

:	SKB ROSEMOUNT INDUSTINGUST Inspector: Nuke Inspector: Surry Weather Conditions: Surry		No.	Notes
	·	Yes	No	1,10,000
Lan	dfill 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		1	
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		X	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1	
	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens of			
	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of		X	
	the CCR management operations.			
		(1))		
R Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))	11	r
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional			
	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			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	1	1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1		
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on			
7.	landfill access roads?			
	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,			
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
10.	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1		
11.	11 1 1 19			

e:	11:15 Weather Conditions: 65°	Yes	No	Notes	
		163	110		
R Lane	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of				
	localized settlement observed on the		\checkmark		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		\wedge		
	CCR?				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		,		
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		X		
	operations that represent a potential disruption		/ \		
	to ongoing CCR management operations? Were conditions observed within the cells or				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens of		V		
	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	represent a potential distuption of the sales,				
	the CCR management operations.	40)	<u> </u>		
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	T		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X			
	information required.	0			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	00			
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	 X	+		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	`			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	X			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	, ,			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	-			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X		
	landfill access roads?		1-1-		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1		
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1		
	corrective action measures below.		-		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control	1 x			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1			
	describe recommended changes below.	-	_		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		1	Ì	
	complaints received during the reporting		X		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		Y	SK	NOHE
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			01-	
	onal Notes:				

		Yes	No	Notes
	(1 - (new 40 CFR 8257 84)			
R Lanc	Hill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84) Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	·
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?		X	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X	
'P En	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		K	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	A Service
11.	1.1.4.10 grad?		1	NONE

e:	8:10 Weather Conditions: 40°	Yes	No	Notes	
		res	110		
R Land	Ifill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of		,	l	
•	localized settlement observed on the				
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X		
	CCP2				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells		/		
	containing CCR or within the general landrill		X		
	operations that represent a potential disruption		()		
	to engoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens of		3 1		
	within the general landfill operations that		X		
	represent a potential disruption of the salety of		()		
	the CCR management operations.		1		
OD The	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting				
4.	period? If answer is no, no additional	\vee			
	information required.	_/\			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	M			
٥,	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?				
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	\			
0.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1/			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on	1	1 ×		
/ •	landfill access roads?				
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
0,	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		IX		
	corrective action measures below.				
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
2.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	\ X			
	describe recommended changes below.	0			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
10.	complaints received during the reporting				
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	-	1 1011	
11.	1. into logged?		X	NONE	
Additi	onal Notes:				

	F-16-20 Inspector: Heatt	Yes	No	Notes
Lan	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		Γ	
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
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.		X	
R Fin	gitive 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.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	\ \X	PONE
11.	1 1 4 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2			POLE
	onal Notes:			

::	Weather Conditions: 23	Yes	No	Notes
		Tes	110	
R Lan	dfill 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?		8	
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?		X	
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.		X	
'R Fi	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(1))		1
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
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.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	NONE
11	1 laints logged?			101-6

e:	Weather Conditions: 40°	Yes	No	Notes	
		1,63	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
R Land	Ifill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of				
	localized settlement observed on the		\checkmark		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		()		
	CCR?				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		X		
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that		\ \ \		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		0		
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>		
'P Euc	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))			
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting				
٠.	period? If answer is no, no additional	N.			
	information required.				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V			
٥.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	1			
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		1		
0.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	V			
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		1		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		~		
7.	landfill access roads?				
	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	1	X		
	corrective action measures below.		l \		
	corrective action incastics between	1			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no,	Y			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1			
	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	1	✓		
	complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		\wedge		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer queens	-	×	NONE	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
A 1 11/41	onal Notes:				

:/	2:45 Weather Conditions: 30	WINI	No	Notes	
	·	Yes	IVU]		
Land	fill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of				
	localized settlement observed on the		\times 1		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing				
	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells				
2.	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X		
	to engoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells of				
<i>.</i>	within the general landfill operations that		X		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	•			
	the CCR management operations.		<u> </u>		
'R Enc	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	())		T	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting		1		
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X			
	information required.	()			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	X			
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landing				
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		1		
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	1			
•	landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X		
	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				
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	V			
	describe recommended changes below.				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
10,	complaints received during the reporting		X		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			N. (
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	No	
المالد الما	onal Notes:				
Addition	mai 11000s.				

:	Weather Conditions:	Yes	No		Notes	
		169				
Land	Hill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)		1	T		
l.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X			
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?		X			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens of within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.		X			
R For	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	4))				
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X				
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?	X				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X			
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		7			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X				
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		7	<	alolle	
11.	- Inimto logged'				NONE	
Additi	onal Notes:					

e:	Weather Conditions: 46°	Yes	No	N	otes
	40 OFD 5257 84)	722			
R Land	Ifill 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?		X		
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.		X		
R Fus	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))	1	Τ	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
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?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X		
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X		
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	NON)E
11.	1 1 de la grand?		X	Nor	

:	1:06 Weather Conditions: 750	77	No	Notes	
	·	Yes	140		
D Land	Ifill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or				
1.	localized settlement observed on the		\propto		
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		4 /		
	CCP2				
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
,	containing CCR or within the general landful	}	4		
	operations that represent a potential disruption		1 ,		
	to engoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cens of				
٥.	within the general landfill operations that		V		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of				
	the CCR management operations.				
CIP 15	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	l))			
	Was CCR received during the reporting				
4.	period? If answer is no, no additional	\sim			
	information required.	\propto			
	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	1			
5.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
6.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	À			
,	landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?	1			
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		X		
7.	landfill access roads?		8		
	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
8.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		1 ×		
	corrective action measures below.			`	
	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	1 ~	^		
	describe recommended changes below.	1 1			
	a total attack citizen				
10.	complaints received during the reporting		X		
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		()		
	1-i-to logged?		1	NONE	
11.	Were the cluzen complaints logger				
Additi	onal Notes:				

:	-21-70 Inspector: Hy 170 Weather Conditions: 180	Yes	No		Notes
		168	140		
Land	fill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)				
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement of localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X		
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?		X		
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.		X		
R Fug	ritive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		T	
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.	X			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X			
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?	X			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X		
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.	X			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	'	Lauf
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			1	3401
Additio	onal Notes:				

1. \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or ocalized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill	Yes		
1. \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or ocalized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	ocalized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells			
2.	ideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells		- (/ I	
2.	CCR? Were conditions observed within the cells	1	Y	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells	1		
	Well continuous observed water			
	containing [1 'R Or WIIIIII HIS REPORT TOTAL			
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?		7	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
- 1	within the general landfill operations that		V	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		~	
	the CCR management operations.			
	tive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4	1))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
٦.	period? If answer is no, no additional	~		
	information required.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	\/		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	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 fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		V	
	landfill access roads?		10	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		1	
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		X	
	corrective action measures below.		+	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	l X		
	describe recommended changes below.	-		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
4.4	Were the citizen complaints logged?		Y	NONE
11.	were the chizen complaints logges.	J	1	

	. [Yes	No	Notes
- T	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
K Lan	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		X	
	CCR?		2	
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		K	
	operations that represent a potential disruption			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or		N	
	within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of		1	
	the CCR management operations.			
		4))		
CR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(+))	T	1
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	X		
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		+	
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	X		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		. /	
7.	landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
٥.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	ļ	X	
	corrective action measures below.			
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
,	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X		1
	describe recommended changes below.	- (
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen		1	
	complaints received during the reporting		X	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11.	10		X	NONE

		Yes	No	Notes
D T on	dfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)			
1.	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			
1.	localized settlement observed on the		1/	
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		$X \perp$	
	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			
٥.	within the general landfill operations that		X	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
TD Eve	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
٠٠.	period? If answer is no, no additional			
	information required.			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			
٥.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	\		
U.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	V		
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		1	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		Y	
7.	landfill access roads?			
8	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the		_	,
٥,,	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			
	corrective action measures below.			
0	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
9.	measures effective? If the answer is no,	\mathbf{X}		
	describe recommended changes below.			
10	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
10.	complaints received during the reporting			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
11	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	MONE
11.	were the chizen complaints logged:			7-07-6

	1-24-36 Inspector: Note 1 2:00 pm Weather Conditions: Cloud	Yes	No	Notes
R Lar	ndfill 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?		Y	
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?		X	
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.		X	
CR Fu	gitive 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.	X		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X		
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?	X		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	New

		Yes	No	Notes
Lai	ndfill 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?		X	
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?		X	
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.		$ \mathcal{X} $	
R Fu	gitive 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			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?			

		Yes	No	Notes
Lan	dfill 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		X	
	CCR?			
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells			
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		1	
	operations that represent a potential disruption		X	
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or			
	within the general landfill operations that		1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			
	the CCR management operations.			
Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting			
	period? If answer is no, no additional	X		
	information required.	//		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust	V		
	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	X		
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on		V	
	landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the			
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		X	
	corrective action measures below.		"	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control			
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X		
	describe recommended changes below.			
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen			
	complaints received during the reporting		X	
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question Were the citizen complaints logged?			MONE
1.			6.0	ALABIA.

Date:	1-3-20 Inspector: Hea	th		
Time:	9:40 Weather Conditions: 40	0		
	<u> </u>	Yes	No	Notes
CCR La	andfill 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?		X	
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?		X	
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.		X	
CCR Fu	ngitive 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?	X		
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?	\checkmark		
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		X	
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		X	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		X	NONE
Addition	test for ben to	in there	cell 4	is now frozen
		V		