WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SHAMROCK ENVIRONMENTAL LANDFILL

ne:	4:300 Weather Conditions: PAG	ner Conditions: PACH Clarky		
		Yes	No	Notes
RL	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	ng manasihikak animalika is 27
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 Fı	ngitive 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.	K		
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	and annotation of the principle	The state of the s
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?		人	
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?		k	etti kantaninga didipikangan jadi saman manamatapira menerindan sisaga sama
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		λ	
).:	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.	X		
0.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question		X	
1.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		\mathcal{X}	