MITCHELL WILLIAMS

Little Rock Rogers Jonesboro Austin **MitchellWilliamsLaw.com**

Mitchell, Williams, Selig, Gates & Woodyard, P.L.L.C.



Walter Wright, Jr. wwright@mwlaw.com (501) 688.8839

Air Enforcement: Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality and Howard County, Arkansas Wallboard Manufacturing Facility Enter into Consent Administrative Order Addressing Alleged Violations

Arkansas Environmental, Energy, and Water Law Blog

10/06/2016

The Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality ("ADEQ") and Certainteed Gypsum Manufacturing, Inc., ("CGM") entered into a Consent Administrative Order ("CAO") dated September 19th addressing alleged air violations. See LIS No. 16-072.

CGM is stated to own and operate a gypsum wallboard manufacturing facility located in Nashville, Arkansas.

The CGM facility operates pursuant to an Air Operating Permit ("Air Permit") ADEQ issued on September 26, 2014. Two subsequent Air Permit revisions are listed in the CAO.

ADEQ personnel are stated to have conducted a compliance inspection of the CGM facility on February 16, 2016. They allegedly determined that there was a failure to conduct weekly observations of opacity at the Secondary Crusher for the week ending April 26, 2015 and the week ending May 10, 2015 (violating Specific Condition 12 of Air Permit R6).

The inspection is also alleged to have determined that CGM failed to conduct weekly observations of opacity at the CP Mill and Flash Calciner for the week ending April 26, 2015 and the week ending May 10, 2015 (violating Specific Condition 32 of Air Permit R6). Also identified as alleged violations was a failure to conduct weekly observations of opacity at:

- 1. the CP Mill Buell System;
- 2. the Stucco Bin Line #1; and
- 3. the Stucco Bin Line #2

... for the week ending April 26, 2015 and the week ending May 10, 2015 (violating specific condition 42 of Air Permit R6).

The CAO further alleges that initial performance testing for opacity at the Mobile Crushing Plant was not conducted by the required date (violating Specific Condition 84 and Plantwide Condition 3 of Air Permit

R7). However, CGM is stated to have conducted initial performance tests for opacity at the referenced source demonstrating that results did not exceed the 12 percent opacity limit of Air Permit R7.

The compliance inspection also allegedly identified CGM's failure to record the monthly periodic inspections of the wet suppression system's water spray nozzles at SN-61, including the date of each inspection and any corrective actions taken. Therefore, it is alleged that at the time of compliance inspection, monthly periodic inspections were not performed for the months of May 2015 through December 2015 (violating Specific Condition 86 of Air Permit R7).

CGM neither admits nor denies the factual and legal allegations.

CGM agrees to:

...demonstrate compliance with Specific Condition 86 of Permit R8, Respondent shall submit copies to ADEQ of the monthly periodic inspections of the wet suppression system's water spray nozzles at SN-61 for the period of April 2016 through June 2016...

A civil penalty of \$2,600 is assessed.

A copy of the CAO can be downloaded here.