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

Were the citizen complaints logged?

9.

10.

11.

menorial on monday 5/26

Tweekly coal combustion residual (CCR) inspection report

Shamrock environmental landfill

Inspector: Kyle Backs row Date: 5/07/05

Time:	9:15 mweather Conditions: Parth Surry 54°				
		Yes	No	Notes	
CCR La	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.84	\$)	1	The state of the s	
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	weet the second	
	gitive 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 information required.	X			
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	X	aumininuu hoimillililililililili		
: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?		<i>X</i> .		
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		~		

Additional Notes:			
The state of the s			
		- m	
10 Annual Control of the Control	A Chiman California Communication and Communication Commun		22

X