

## **EXAMPLE 1 NO ACTIVITY SCENARIOS**

### **Stratospheric Ozone Protection Monitoring Report (condition \_\_\_)**

During the period of July 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, there were no activities conducted at Company XYZ involving the installation, maintenance, removal or disposal of any appliances containing CFCs or any other class I or class II substances as defined in §82.104 of 40 CFR Part 82. As such, the requirements of §82.104 were not triggered during the period. Company XYZ's Stratospheric Ozone Protection Log for the period is provided for your records.

### **Asbestos Abatement Monitoring Report (condition \_\_\_)**

During the period of July 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, there were no asbestos projects conducted at Company XYZ as defined under section 14.03 of OAPCA regulation 1. As such, the requirements in of condition \_\_\_ were not triggered during the period.

### **Complaint Monitoring (condition \_\_\_)**

During the period of July 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, Company XYZ did not receive any air quality related complaints directly, nor notification of any air quality related complaints through OAPCA or any other agency. During this same period, Company XYZ maintained a public access phone line staffed during operating hours for purposes of receiving complaints. During periods when the facility was not operational, incoming calls were monitored using a voice messaging/answering system which prompted the caller to leave a message providing details of the complaint. The phone number for calling in air quality related complaints and inquiries is posted on the facility boundary at locations visible by the general public and is a listed number.

**EXAMPLE 2**  
**STRATOSPHERIC OZONE PROTECTION**  
**REQUIREMENTS TRIGGERED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

**Stratospheric Ozone Protection Monitoring Report (condition \_\_)**

During the period of January 1, 1999 through June 30, 1999, there were two separate occurrences involving maintenance of appliances containing CFCs as defined in §82.104 of 40 CFR Part 82. As such, the requirements of §82.104 were triggered during the period. For both cases, Company XYZ complied with the additional monitoring, record keeping and reporting requirements triggered by the maintenance activities. The first case involved the servicing and repair of all the “package” air conditioning units serving the office area. The second case involved replacing the compressor in the chiller that serves the cold storage building used to store fresh produce prior to processing. In both cases, maintenance was completed by certified contractors who provided verification of current certification. Company XYZ’s Stratospheric Ozone Protection Log for the period is provided for your records.

## STRATOSPHERIC OZONE PROTECTION SUMMARY

Facility: Company XYZ

Reporting Period: January 1, 1999 through June 30, 1999

Date	Type of Action	Description of Action	Attachments	Contracted or In-house?
4/22/99	Routine Service	Routine service of 10 packaged air conditioning units located on the office complex building.	copy of contractor certification	contracted
5/10/99	Replacement	Replaced one of the compressors in chiller serving the cold storage building.	copy of contractor certification	contracted

\*\*instructions on back\*\*

Maintenance Supervisor:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_, date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXAMPLE 3**  
**COMPLAINT MONITORING**  
**COMPLAINTS RECEIVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

**Complaint Monitoring (condition \_\_\_\_)**

During the period of July 1, 1999 through December 30, 1999, Company XYZ maintained a public access phone line staffed during operating hours for purposes of receiving complaints. During periods when the facility was not operational, incoming calls were monitored using a voice messaging/answering system which prompted the caller to leave a message providing details of the complaint. The phone number for calling in air quality related complaints and inquiries is posted on the facility boundary at locations visible by the general public and is a listed number.

During this reporting period, a total of 5 air quality related complaints were received alleging impacts caused by emissions from Company XYZ's Port Townsend facility. All the complaints were investigated and the necessary notifications to OAPCA were made in accordance with the requirements in the permit. Conclusions from the investigations were made based on information obtained through the complaint investigation as well as contemporaneous operating records for the facility. The attached table summarizes complaints received during the reporting period. Complaint investigation records for each complaint are also attached for your records.

Out of the five complaints received, only two were found to be directly attributable to emissions from Company XYZ's Port Townsend facility. These two complaints were filed on the same day and alleged that an unreasonable buildup of dust from log yard operations was deposited on personal vehicles parked for the day on property located adjacent to the North boundary of the log yard. Company XYZ's investigation found that the operator of the water truck used to water down the log yard for purposes of dust control neglected to water down the areas directly adjacent to the subject parking lot during the day the vehicles were impacted. Company XYZ concurs that dust from the log yard likely impacted the vehicles. Immediate actions were taken to initiate watering of this area and to wash the impacted vehicles. The log yard manager was directed to be more thorough and water down all areas of the log yard during dry conditions.

The other three complaints alleged that emissions from Company XYZ's boilers caused black soot to be deposited throughout a large area to the Southeast of the facility. Two of the three complainants claimed witnessing significant quantities of airborne black soot. The date and approximate time of the observed impacts for two of the complaints was the afternoon of Sunday, July 16, 1999. The date and approximate time of the remaining complaint was the afternoon of Monday, July 17, 1999. Investigation of these complaints has concluded that the deposited and airborne soot observed by the complainants was due to emissions from a nearby ship which was docked in the port at the time. The port docking facilities are directly adjacent to Company XYZ's West property boundary.

For the July 16 episode, contemporaneous operating records verify that no emission unit at Company XYZ's Port Townsend facility was operating at the time. For the July 17 episode, emission units were operational. However, monitoring records do not indicate any malfunctions of emission unit or pollution control devices during this time frame. Also, opacity survey records for the survey conducted on this date indicate no observed opacity from the facility, but do note that there was visible emissions from the stacks on the ship docked nearby. In addition, the airborne black soot was observed and noted by the Environmental Manager as well as other employees as coming emanating from the ship's stacks during the July 17 episode. Based on these observations and records, Company XYZ's conclusion is that the deposited and airborne soot observed by the complainants during both dates was due to emissions from the nearby docked ship.

## COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT

Facility: Company XYZ

Reporting Period: July 1, 1999 through December 30, 1999

Complaint Received	Alleged Impact Occurred	Complaint Description	Investigation Conclusions	Investigation Completed
7/18/99 11:30 am	7/16/99 2:00 pm	Airborne black soot observed "raining down" like snow while jogging along Ocean Drive. Soot covered everything for 50 yards along Ocean Drive including trees, benches, parked vehicles and the sidewalk. Complainant felt that emissions were emanating from Company XYZ's facility.	Airborne and deposited soot due to emissions from the ship docked at the nearby port of Port Townsend boat yard facility.	7/18/99
7/18/99 3:30 pm	7/16/99 2:45 pm	Black, choking smoke fumigating the area along Ocean drive directly adjacent to Company XYZ's Port Townsend facility. Complainant, who works at a business located on Ocean Drive, believed the smoke was coming from Company XYZ's boilers. Complainant stated that the smoke was choking her and she went home sick and vomiting to make an appointment with her physician.	Airborne and deposited soot due to emissions from the ship docked at the nearby port of Port Townsend boat yard facility.	7/18/99
7/18/99 8:30 am	7/16/99 3:00 pm	Black dust and ash flakes blanketing the entire area along Ocean drive for a distance of 100 yards in front of Company XYZ's facility. Complainant assumed the dust and ash was deposited by Company XYZ's boilers. Complainant claimed the ash ruined his shoes as he walked through it on his way home from work.	Airborne and deposited soot due to emissions from the ship docked at the nearby port of Port Townsend boat yard facility.	7/18/99
8/15/99 5:30 pm	8/15/99 during day	Log yard dust covering complainants vehicle which was parked in the parking lot owned by the company he works for. Complainant upset since he just had his vehicle washed and waxed the day before. Complainant upset and requesting the cost for cleaning his vehicle be covered by Company XYZ.	Log yard haul road adjacent to the parking lot was dry and dusty. Water truck was used throughout the day to wet down haul roads. However, this particular road was not wetted down. Dry conditions of the haul road were the likely cause of the dust deposited on adjacent parked vehicles.	8/16/99
8/15/99 7:00 pm	8/15/99 4:30 pm	Found personal vehicle covered with bark dust after being parked for work day. Complainant stated that the dust obviously came from the log yard and expected to be reimbursed for vehicle cleaning costs.	Log yard haul road adjacent to the parking lot was dry and dusty. Water truck was used throughout the day to wet down haul roads. However, this particular road was not wetted down. Dry conditions of the haul road were the likely cause of the dust deposited on adjacent parked vehicles.	8/16/99

Maintenance Supervisor:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_, date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXAMPLE 4**  
**SUMMARY OF MONTHLY FUGITIVE DUST/EMISSIONS AUDITS**

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

REPORTING PERIOD: \_\_\_\_\_

DUST CONTROL MEASURES		AUDIT RESULTS					
MINIMUM FUGITIVE DUST/EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURE	DATE:						
Minimizing the generation of airborne dust by reducing the distance particulate laden materials are dropped when loading trucks, barges, conveyors and railcars, to a minimum distance which is practical, based on the physical constraints of equipment and the potential for generation of airborne dust from the operation.	barge loading operations						
	rail car loading						
	truck loading						
	conveyor drops throughout the mill						
Covering materials during transport or storage if fugitive dust emissions are observed.	Are truck loads covered by tarps?						
	Visible dust from truck loads observed?						
Equipping truck loadout bins with discharge chutes sufficient to prevent visible fugitive dust clouds which remain airborne beyond the truck loading area.	Are all truck bins equipped with discharge chutes?						
	Visible dust plume during chip truck loading which remains airborne beyond loading area?						

DUST CONTROL MEASURES		AUDIT RESULTS					
MINIMUM FUGITIVE DUST/EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURE	DATE:						
	Visible dust plume during planer shavings truck loading which remains airborne beyond loading area?						
Applying water or another OAPCA approved dust suppressant to non-paved roads at the site when visible dust plumes due to truck traffic remain airborne for longer than 30 seconds.	Was there evidence that non-paved roads were watered or treated with dust suppressant?						
	Observe the following vehicles during operation on non-paved surfaces: a) chip truck b) front end loader c) log truck						
Limiting vehicle and truck speeds on paved and non-paved roads and other areas to speeds sufficiently low to prevent generation of dust plumes which remain airborne for longer than 30 seconds.	Observe the following vehicles during operation on non-pave roads: a) chip truck b) front end loader c) log truck						
	Observe the following vehicles during operation on paved roads: a) chip truck b) front end loader c) log truck						
Cleaning or sweeping surfaces of paved roads at a frequency sufficient to prevent the generation of dust plumes which remain airborne for longer than 30 seconds.	Observe the following vehicles during operation on paved roads: a) chip truck b) front end loader c) log truck						
Repairing leaks from veneer dryer on a weekly basis.	Visible leaks in veneer dryers?						

DUST CONTROL MEASURES		AUDIT RESULTS					
MINIMUM FUGITIVE DUST/EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURE	DATE:						
	Do maintenance logs indicate that fugitive leaks are being repaired on a weekly basis?						
Enclosing elevators, material transport lines and material transport belts which are a source of fugitive emissions.	Are there any open conveyors, elevators, or other material transport lines that exhibit visible fugitive emissions?						
Maintaining solid material transfer systems including pneumatic transport lines, conveyors, diverters, target boxes, cyclones and baghouses such that there are no visible fugitive emissions greater than 20% opacity.	plywood processing area						
	veneer processing area						
	planer mill						
	short lumber planer mill						
	steam plant						
Immediately initiating clean-up of spills of materials which contain volatile organic compounds (VOCs) including plywood resin, form oil, paints or any other materials containing VOCs.	sawmill						
	plywood layup area						
Storing VOC containing materials in covered containers.	form oil coating area						
	plywood layup area						
	spray booth area						
	form oil coating area						

Compliance with conditions?

- 7.12 \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.13 \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.14 \_\_\_\_\_



**EXAMPLE 5**  
**COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING STATISTICS REPORT (NO COMS)**

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

REPORTING PERIOD: From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Person Completing This Report: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Month:</b>							
<b>GENERAL</b>							
# Permit Deviations (attach reports)							
# Days Mill Operated							
Hours Mill Operated							
Hours Pollution Control Equipment Inoperable (attach Equipment Malfunction reports)							
# Complaints Received							
# Complaints Forwarded to County health							
# Asbestos Projects							
# Projects triggering 40 CFR Part 82							
<b>OPACITY MONITORING</b>							
# Daily Opacity Surveys Completed							
# Method 9 Readings For Boiler (EU2)							
# Method 9 Readings For Other Emission Units							
# Violations Noted (attach Method 9 forms)							
# Fugitive Emissions Leaks Observed							
Fugitive Leaks Causing Complaint or Impact (attach complaint report)							
# Fugitive Dust Plumes Observed							
Fugitive Dust Causing Complaint or Impact? (attach complaint report)							
<b>BOILER POLLUTION CONTROL SUMMARY</b>							
Hours Boilers Operational (OP) (including startup/shutdown and malfunction)							
Hours Startup & shutdown (SS)							
Hours Malfunction (M) (as approved by OAPCA)							
Hours Wash Cycle (WC)							
Hours Scrubber Out-of-Range:  durations > 1 hour when one or more parameters are out-of- range	total (t)						
	startup & shutdown (ss)						
	wash cycle (wc)						
	malfunction (m)						
Percent of Time Out-of-range, Total = (t)/(OP)							
Percent of Time Out-of-Range, Adjusted = (t-ss-wc-m)/(OP)							
<b>PARTICULATE</b>							
# Particulate Source Tests Conducted							

The Method 9 readings completed during the period from \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_, 2000, were conducted by Company XYZ in accordance with the requirements specified in condition \_\_ of the permit.

**EXAMPLE 6  
MONTHLY COMS SUMMARY REPORT**

**Pollutant:** Opacity, 6 minute average

**Reporting Dates:** From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_

**Company Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Emission Limitation:**

EUI stack emissions shall not exhibit greater than 20 percent opacity (6-minute average), except for one 6-minute period per hour of not more than 27 percent opacity, and except during periods of startup, shutdown or malfunction.

**Monitor Manufacturer and Model No:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Date of latest CEM relative accuracy test audit:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of latest cylinder gas audit:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Emission Unit # and description:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total EU operating time during reporting period:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total monitor operating time during reporting period:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Emission Data Summary</b>	<b>CEMS Performance Summary</b>
1. Excess emissions in reporting period due to:	1. COMS down time in reporting period due to:
a. startup/shutdown:	a. monitoring equipment malfunction:
b. control equipment malfunctions:	b. non-monitoring equip malfunction:
c. process malfunctions:	c. quality assurance calibration:
d. other known causes:	d. other known causes:
e. unknown causes:	e. unknown causes:
2. Total duration of excess emissions:	2. Total COMS down time:
3. Percent of time excess emissions occurred $[\text{=}((\text{tot duration excess emiss})/(\text{tot source operating time}))\times 100]$ :	3. Percent of time COMS down $[\text{=}((\text{tot COMS downtime})/(\text{tot source operating time}))\times 100]$ :
4. Maximum 3 minute average in reporting period:	