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

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes	No		Notes
CD T	condition to the Transaction (not 40 CTD) cores of	Marsannianno caracterista	140		140067
1:	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84 Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or)	7		
Ţ. ż.	localized settlement observed on the				
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing				
N aturalia	CCR?	WANTE OF THE PARTY			ia de la composición
2.	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill				
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
3.:	to ongoing CCR management operations?	······································	/		
34	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of		\ \(\chi \)		
	the CCR management operations.				
D Fo		ari	<u> </u>		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting	"		T.	
-7.	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?				
:6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		(
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		\sim		
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not		('		
 	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		<u> </u>		otimpyrimanniikiimannsymineims
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
8.	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the	·			
٠,	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe				
	corrective action measures below.	1000			
9,	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	X			
ng masi proc	describe recommended changes below.			A 11 A 1	ata a sa
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting		(\		
, ,	period? If the answer is yes, answer question			,	
1.	Were the citizen complaints logged?	L	X		·
			1	:	