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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Post-closure monitoring requirements for the Cactus Spring Waste Trenches (Corrective Action Unit [CAU] 426) (Figure 1) are described in Closure Report for Corrective Action Unit 426, Cactus Spring Waste Trenches, Tonopah Test Range, Nevada, report number DOE/NV--226. The Closure Report (CR) was submitted to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) on August 14, 1998. Permeability results of soils adjacent to the engineered cover and a request for closure of CAU 404 were transmitted to the NDEP on April 29, 1999. The CR (containing the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan) was approved by the NDEP on May 13, 1999.

Post-closure monitoring at CAU 426 consists of the following:

- Site inspections done twice a year to evaluate the condition of the unit.
- Verification that the site is secure.
- Notice of any subsidence or deficiencies that may compromise the integrity of the unit.
- Remedy of any deficiencies within 90 days of discovery.
- Preparation and submittal of an annual report.

Site inspections were conducted on June 19, 2000, and November 21, 2000. All inspections were made after NDEP approval of the CR, and were conducted in accordance with the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan in the NDEP-approved CR.

This report includes copies of the inspection checklists, photographs, recommendations, and conclusions. The Post-Closure Inspection Checklists are found in Attachment A, a copy of the field notes is found in Attachment B, and copies of the inspection photographs are found in Attachment C.

2.0 INSPECTION RESULTS

2.1 June 19, 2000 Inspection

The first inspection was completed on June 19, 2000. Rabbit scat and small mammal burrows were observed on the site. Small mammal burrows were present along the toe of the south and east cover side slopes allowing access to the cover area by small mammals. Burrows were filled with soil and the fence re-buried. The burrows have not effected the integrity of the cover. The vegetation present on the cover and in the staging area inside the fence appears sparse but healthy. There is no evidence of erosion of the cover or staging area. Two signs were reattached to the fence using hog rings. No further maintenance or repairs are recommended.

2.2 November 21, 2000 Inspection

The fourth inspection was completed on November 21, 2000. Small and shallow
FIGURE 1
CACTUS SPRING WASTE TRENCHES
CAU 426 LOCATION MAP
burrowing/scratchings (approximately 5 centimeters [cm] [2 inches [in.]]) to 16 cm (6 in) in diameter and depth) were observed along the fence line, not on the cover. The vegetation on the cover and staging area was healthy with a good variety of shrubs and grasses present. The cover was observed to be stable with no noticeable erosion, settling, or cracking. Evaluation of the cover area plant diversity and density is recommended for the fifth year after revegetation (2002) to determine if the site has been successfully reclaimed or if remediation work is necessary. No further maintenance or repairs are recommended at this time.

3.0 VEGETATIVE MONITORING

In addition to the twice annual inspections by Bechtel Nevada Environmental Restoration personnel, the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan contained in the approved CR, proposed vegetative monitoring in the first, third, and fifth year after revegetation was completed. Vegetative monitoring for the first year after revegetation was performed as proposed in the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan. The vegetative monitoring conducted during the site inspections on May 24, 2000, and November 14, 2000 fulfill the proposed monitoring in the third year after completion of site revegetation. Germination, wildlife usage, and erosion condition of the soil were observed. Site plant densities were determined by placing a quadrat (1 meter by 1 meter square frame) at randomly selected locations within the fenced area and counting the number and type of plant species present within the quadrat. A total of 45 randomly selected locations were surveyed in May; 15 on the cover area, and 30 on the staging area (inside the fence but off of the cover). The number and type of plants within each randomly placed quadrat was recorded on field data sheets. Table 1 presents the summarized data for the May 24 site visit. Wildlife usage of the site was determined by recording the presence of animal scat within the quadrats. The erosion condition of the soil over the site in general was determined using an erosion condition classification.

Ten of the 12 seeded species were observed at the site. Eight seeded species were observed on the cover, with approximately five seeded species present per square meter (1.2 square yards). In the staging area, 10 of the 12 seeded species were observed, with approximately eight seeded species present per square meter (1.2 square yards). In addition, less than one non-seeded plant was observed per square meter on the cover, and approximately 14 non-seeded plants per square meter were observed in the staging area. (Non-seeded plants include two invasive nuisance species commonly known as halogen and wheat grass.) As the native species become better established, these invasive species will decline in numbers. Straw mulch from the revegetation activities is still present on both the cover and staging area but covers five percent or less of the areas. No evidence of grazing by rabbits or other species was observed within the fence. However, rabbit scat was observed in all of the quadrats sampled in the staging area, and in approximately one third of the quadrats sampled on the cover. Minor scratching/burrowing was observed in the vegetative portion of the cover. No signs of erosion, settling, or cracking of the cover or of the staging area were observed. The overall condition of the vegetative cover is excellent with a good diversity of native shrubs and grasses established. In addition, many species were observed to be flowering and setting seed.
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No evidence of erosion was noted in any of the inspections, indicating that the overland runoff is being properly diverted around the cover. Rabbits have burrowed under the fence in several areas but the presence of burrows in the area do not appear to have adversely effected the cover. The density of seedlings was less than anticipated but a good diversity of native plant species has established in the area and is producing seed. The overall condition of the vegetative cover is excellent.

Monitoring of the vegetation is recommended following the growing season (May/June) in the fifth year after revegetation (2002) as proposed in the CR. Modifications/repairs to the cover or a change in the inspection frequency are not recommended as a result of the observations conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIFE FORM</th>
<th>GENUS</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>PLANT DENSITY (Plants/m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Artemisia</td>
<td>nova</td>
<td>Black sagebrush</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Atriplex</td>
<td>canescens var. Canescens</td>
<td>Fourwing saltbrush</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Atriplex</td>
<td>conferifolia</td>
<td>Shadscale saltbrush</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Chrysothamnus</td>
<td>viscidiflorus</td>
<td>Low rabbitbrush</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Ephedra</td>
<td>nevadensis</td>
<td>Nevada jointfir</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Ericameria</td>
<td>nauseosus</td>
<td>Rubber rabbitbrush</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Krascheninnikovia (Ceratoides)</td>
<td>lanata</td>
<td>Winterfat</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub</td>
<td>Sarcobatus</td>
<td>vermiculatus</td>
<td>Black greasewood</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Achnatherum (Oryzopsis)</td>
<td>hymenoides</td>
<td>Indian ricegrass</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Elymus (Sitanion)</td>
<td>elymoides ssp. elymoides</td>
<td>Bottlebrush squirreltail</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Pleuraphis (Hilaria)</td>
<td>jamesii</td>
<td>Galleta grass</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forb</td>
<td>Sphaeralcea</td>
<td>ambiguus</td>
<td>Apricot globemallow</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SEEDED</strong></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbs</td>
<td>Halogeton</td>
<td>glomeratus</td>
<td>Halogeton</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasses</td>
<td>Triticum</td>
<td>aestivum</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-SEEDED</strong></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL Plants/m²</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% MULCH</strong></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% PLOTS w/ SCAT</strong></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A

INSPECTION CHECKLISTS
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CACTUS SPRING WASTE TRENCHES, POST-CLOSURE MONITORING CHECKLIST

Date of Last Inspection: 11/30/1999
Reason for Last Inspection: Bi-Annually
Responsible Agency: DOE
Project Manager: Wayne Johnson
Inspection Date: 6/19/00
Inspector (name, title, organization): Ken Campbell, Geologist/Hydrologist
Assistant Inspector (name, title, organization):

**A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**
1. All checklist items must be completed and detailed comments made to document the results of the site inspection. The completed checklist is part of the field record of the inspection. Additional pages should be used as necessary to ensure that a complete record is made. Attach the additional pages and number all pages upon completion of the inspection.
2. Any checklist line item marked by an inspector in a SHADED BOX, must be fully explained or an appropriate reference to previous reports provided. The purpose of this requirement is to provide a written explanation of inspector observations and the inspector’s rationale for conclusions and recommendations. Explanations are to be placed on additional attachments and cross-referenced appropriately. Explanations, in addition to narrative, will take the form of sketches, measurements, annotated site maps.
3. The site inspection is a walking inspection of the entire site including the perimeter and sufficient transects to be able to inspect the entire surface and all features specifically described in this checklist.
4. A standard set of color 35mm photographs (or equivalent) is required. In addition, all anomalous features or new features (such as changes in adjacent area land use) are to be photographed. A photo log entry will be made for each photograph taken.
5. The site inspection is biannually with formal reporting to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection to be done annually. The annual report will include an executive summary, this inspection checklist with field notes and photo log attached, and recommendations and conclusions.

**B. PREPARATION (To be completed prior to site visit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Site as-built plans and site base map reviewed.
   a. Were anomalies or trends detected on previous inspections?
   b. Was maintenance performed?

2. Previous inspection reports reviewed.
   a. Were anomalies or trends detected on previous inspections?

3. Site maintenance and repair records reviewed.
   a. Has site repair resulted in a change from as-built conditions?
   b. Are revised as-builts available that reflect repair changes?

**C. SITE INSPECTION (To be completed during inspection)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjacent off-site features within watershed areas.
   a. Have there been any changes in use of adjacent area?
   b. Are there any new roads or trails?
   c. Has there been a change in the position of nearby washes?
   d. Has there been lateral excursion or erosion/deposition of nearby washes?
   e. Are there new drainage channels?
   f. Change in surrounding vegetation?

2. Security fence, signs.
   a. Displacement of fences, site markers, boundary markers, or monuments?
   b. Have any signs been damaged or removed? (Number of signs replaced: 4)
   c. Were gates locked?
### CACTUS SPRING WASTE TRENCHES, POST-CLOSURE MONITORING CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Waste Unit cover.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is there evidence of settling?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is there cracking?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is there evidence of erosion around the cap (wind or water)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Is there evidence of animal burrowing?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>fewer burrows 5 ft. toe of cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Have the site markers been disturbed by man or natural processes?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Do natural processes threaten to integrity of any cover or site marker?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Vegetative cover.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is perimeter fence or mesh fencing damaged?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is there evidence of horses or rabbits on site?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>fewer burrows inside fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is organic mulch adequate to prevent erosion?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Are weedy annual plants present? If yes, are they a problem?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Are seeded plant species found on site?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Is there evidence of plant mortality?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Photo Documentation</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Has a photo log been prepared?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of photos exposed (5)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. FIELD CONCLUSIONS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there an imminent hazard to the integrity of the unit? (Immediate report required)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person/Agency to whom report made:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are more frequent inspections required?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are existing maintenance/repair actions satisfactory?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is other maintenance/repair necessary?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is current status/condition of vegetative cover satisfactory?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Rationale for field conclusions:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small mammals are still burrowing inside fenced area, but not affecting cover integrity or function. Vegetation on cover and in staging area looks good, healthy. No evidence of erosion of cover or staging area. Fencing in excellent shape except where rabbits are getting under fence.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. CERTIFICATION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have conducted an inspection of the Cactus Spring Waste Trenches, CAU 426, at the TTR in accordance with the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan (see Closure Report) as recorded on this checklist, attached sheets, field notes, photo logs, and photographs.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector's Signature:</td>
<td>Kevin B. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name:</td>
<td>Kevin B. Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>BW Geologist/Hydrogeologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>6/19/00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CACTUS SPRING WASTE TRENCHES, POST-CLOSURE MONITORING CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Last Inspection: 11/21/00</th>
<th>Reason for Last Inspection: Bi-Annual Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Agency: DOE/NV</td>
<td>Project Manager: U. Johnson, BN/ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date: 11/21/00</td>
<td>Inspector (name, title, organization): Den Tobin, Scientist, BN/ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Inspector (name, title, organization):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. All checklist items must be completed and detailed comments made to document the results of the site inspection. The completed checklist is part of the field record of the inspection. Additional pages should be used as necessary to ensure that a complete record is made. Attach the additional pages and number all pages upon completion of the inspection.

2. Any checklist line item marked by an inspector in a SHADED BOX, must be fully explained or an appropriate reference to previous reports provided. The purpose of this requirement is to provide a written explanation of inspector observations and the inspector's rationale for conclusions and recommendations. Explanations are to be placed on additional attachments and cross-referenced appropriately. Explanations, in addition to narrative, will take the form of sketches, measurements, annotated site maps.

4. The site inspection is a walking inspection of the entire site including the perimeter and sufficient transects to be able to inspect the entire surface and all features specifically described in this checklist.

5. A standard set of color 35mm photographs (or equivalent) is required. In addition, all anomalous features or new features (such as changes in adjacent area land use) are to be photographed. A photo log entry will be made for each photograph taken.

6. This unit will be inspected biannually with formal reporting to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection to be done annually. The annual report will include an executive summary, this inspection checklist with field notes and photo log attached, and recommendations and conclusions.

### B. PREPARATION (To be completed prior to site visit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Site as-built plans and site base map reviewed.

2. Previous inspection reports reviewed.
   a. Were anomalies or trends detected on previous inspections?
   b. Was maintenance performed?

3. Site maintenance and repair records reviewed.
   a. Has site repair resulted in a change from as-built conditions?
   b. Are revised as-bults available that reflect repair changes?

### C. SITE INSPECTION (To be completed during inspection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Adjacent off-site features within watershed areas.
   a. Have there been any changes in use of adjacent area?
   b. Are there any new roads or trails?
   c. Has there been a change in the position of nearby washes?
   d. Has there been lateral excursion or erosion/deposition of nearby washes?
   e. Are there new drainage channels?
   f. Change in surrounding vegetation?

2. Security fence, signs.
   a. Displacement of fences, site markers, boundary markers, or monuments?
   b. Have any signs been damaged or removed?
      (Number of signs replaced: 6)
   c. Were gates locked?
      No lock on gate
### CACTUS SPRING WASTE TRENCHES, POST-CLOSURE MONITORING CHECKLIST

#### 3. Waste Unit cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Vegetative cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rabbit scratching under mesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Photo Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D. FIELD CONCLUSIONS

1. Is there an imminent hazard to the integrity of the unit? (Immediate report required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Person/Agency to whom report made:

2. Are more frequent inspections required?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Are existing maintenance/repair actions satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Is other maintenance/repair necessary?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Is current status/condition of vegetative cover satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Rationale for field conclusions: Observations indicate cover is in good condition. Evidence of rabbits entering site under mesh.

#### E. CERTIFICATION

I have conducted an inspection of the Cactus Spring Waste Trenches, CAU 426, at the TTR in accordance with the Post-Closure Monitoring Plan (see Closure Report) as recorded on this checklist, attached sheets, field notes, photo logs, and photographs.

Chief Inspector's Signature: 

Printed Name: Daniel E. Tobiasen

Title: Scientist

Date: 11/21/00
ATTACHMENT B

FIELD NOTES
13:23 arrive on site at Cactus Springs Waste Trenches. City 426
Cover appears in excellent condition. No obvious erosion or failure.
Vegetation on cover and on staging area healthy. Vegetation appears more abundant than at Roller Coaster.

Fencing and gate in good condition; no breaks.
Reach fencing in good condition, one spot on north fence line where mesh does not buried providing easy access for animals.
Sign on gate in excellent shape.
Animal burrows present along fence line and just inside fence.
Very few burrows on cover itself.

5 photographs of cover and staging area taken.

Completed site inspection, depart site.
A partial page from a document with handwritten notes. The page contains text discussing a post-closure inspection of a project titled "Cactus Spring". The text details observations of the fence, signs, and gate, noting evidence of small animals scratching under mesh fencing, no damage noted, and minor burrowing noted inside the fence line. It also mentions the cap is in good condition with no evidence of erosion, vegetation is healthy and agree with a wide variety of flowers and grasses, and completion of the Cactus Spring inspection.
ATTACHMENT C

PHOTOGRAPH LOG AND PHOTOGRAPHS
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
## PHOTOGRAPH LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHOTO NUMBER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/24/2000</td>
<td>View of the cover looking northeast. Vegetation is healthy but sparse compared to native areas outside fenced area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/24/2000</td>
<td>View of the staging area taken from entrance gate looking east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/19/2000</td>
<td>View to the east from outside gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/19/2000</td>
<td>View to the north of the cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11/14/2000</td>
<td>View to the east of staging area and cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11/14/2000</td>
<td>View to the north of cover. Vegetation sparse but healthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11/21/2000</td>
<td>View to the east from gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11/21/2000</td>
<td>View to the southwest of cover.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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