

that the owners had been generally cooperative and had implemented most of his control suggestions resulting in greatly improved control of emissions (R. 12). The investigator recommended that the Company continue to dampen the roadway and also wet down the face of the rock prior to blasting. He further said that the area around the truck dump should be wetted, additional spray nozzles placed around the primary crusher and antifreeze added to the spray solution when appropriate (R. 16).

During the second hearing, Respondent witnesses, mostly employees or persons indirectly connected with the quarry (such as rock haulers) who resided nearby, testified that they: were not irritated or frightened by the blasting (R. 127, 139, 145, 153); were not bothered by dust from the quarry (R. 128, 134, 140, 144, 153, 159); were not prevented from hanging clothes outside because of dust soiling (R. 128, 140); and, did not notice any blowing dust (R. 135, 146, 150, 154).

Testimony from the plant superintendent, a consulting engineer and a blasting powder salesman indicates that Respondent is careful in limiting the size of the blast in order to control sound and vibrations within limits recommended by the Bureau of Mines. The idea of using a blasting mat to control blasting dust was soundly rejected by experts and company officials from safety and practical viewpoints. It was stated that the mats, heavy cables woven together, might interfere with the wires leading to the explosive charge and in any event were not effective to control dust.

Even prior to the filing of the Complaint the Respondent had been very cooperative in following Agency directions to control dust emissions. The Company entered voluntarily into a program resulting in: 1) enclosures on the secondary crushers, screening tower and bins, 2) installation of a spray system consisting of a 1500 gallon tank, wetting chemicals, piping and spray nozzles for wetting the limestone at the outlets of the primary crusher and on the conveying belts carrying limestone back to the secondary crusher, 3) an 8,000 gallon water truck for wetting the surface area around the plant, 4) the oiling and chipping of the plant area adjacent to the highway, and 5) an experimental program to reduce dust from the drillholes during blasting.

The only remaining controls that appear to be called for are: installation of additional spray nozzles to cover the surge bin located on top of the primary crusher, addition of antifreeze chemicals to the spray system during freezing weather, and possible wetting of the rock face before blasting.

We find from the evidence that Respondent's employees occasionally failed to follow directions in wetting the road twice a day and that on those occasions the Company did cause excessive emissions of rock dust in violation of Section 9(a) of the Environmental Protection Act. The Complainant has not suggested what more

the Respondent should do in order to control the emissions. We approve of steps taken by the Respondent thus far and will require that the additional spraying be included in the blasting operation. No monetary penalty will be imposed.

ORDER

It is ordered that:

1. Respondent Denny & Simpson Stone Co., Inc. cease and desist from the violations found in this Opinion.
2. That Respondent within 35 days install additional spray nozzles to cover the surge bin located on top of the primary crusher and immediately include as a part of the blasting procedure wetting of the rock face prior to blasting and addition of anti-freeze chemicals to the spray system during freezing weather.
3. Respondent shall make every reasonable effort to conduct its blasting operations under such wind and atmospheric conditions as will minimize the nuisance in the surrounding areas.

I, Christan L. Moffett, Clerk of the Illinois Pollution Control Board, hereby certify the above Opinion and Order was adopted this 30th day of January, 1973 by a vote of 3 to 0.

Christan L. Moffett

