Time: 10:304 Weather Conditions: Closely mist 560°

CCR Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84)  1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by 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 sususceptable 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 streetive? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question  11. Were the citizen complaints logged?								
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the Safety of the CCR management operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?  6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation?  7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	<del>,</del>		Y	es	No	 Not	es	
1. Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?  2. Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the Safety of the CCR management operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?  6. If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation?  7. Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?  8. Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.  9. Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.  10. Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question	CCR L	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	84)			 		7
containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?  3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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		Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing			X	 estillite landiine in <u>marijanga</u>		<del> </del>
3. Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.  CCR Fugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))  4. Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.  5. Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust 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.	containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption		•	X	emendiadis etterioren pian essa arang	<del>iemastas setudija adaman</del>	***************************************
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	3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of	f		>	Antonia de la composición del composición de la composición de la composición del composición de la co		
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	CCR Fu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))			********		
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		Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional	X			<del>vinos das <sub>e</sub> de</del> mante inm	The state of the s	
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 ineasures 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.	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	r	*******	manusainaidhe			
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.	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not			k		And the second s	
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.				k	<del>(************************************</del>		
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.	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			بح	en e	egeneration (1997) (199	
complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X			(Vining and Asserting as		
11. Were the citizen complaints logged?	i To seed to be	complaints received during the reporting	e Table less of Market		X			
	11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	:		X			

Additional Notes:	}
<del>Proprieta de la company de la</del>	
	The state of the s