

**MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
FOR
ALLAN MYERS MD, INC.
2203 OLD MOUNTAIN ROAD
JOPPA MARYLAND 21085**

Hearing Date: June 7, 2017
Abingdon Branch of the Harford County Public Library
2510 Tollgate Road
Abingdon, MD 21009

Purpose of the Hearing: The purpose of the public hearing was to receive comment on the Maryland Department of the Environment's (MDE's) Tentative Determination for an air quality permit to construct for the installation of a 300 ton per hour crushing and screening plant powered by two (2) diesel engines to be located at 2203 Old Mountain Road in Joppa, Maryland.

Tentative Determination: The Department's Tentative Determination for the air quality related permit to construct concluded that the emissions from the proposed project would meet all applicable regulatory requirements and the air quality permit to construct should, therefore, be issued.

Attendance:

Approximately 42 members of the general public attended the hearing. Ms. Shannon Heafey of the Air and Radiation Administration (ARA) of MDE presided as Hearing Officer. Allan Myers MD, Inc. was represented by Rick Tisa. Mr. Dennis Borie presented ARA's hearing statement.

Comment Period: The comment period on the application expired on August 22, 2017. Comments were received by the public both at the hearing and in writing.

1. June 7, 2017 public hearing transcript
2. June 7, 2017 letter from Judy Rose
3. June 7, 2017 email from Sandy Lee
4. June 7, 2017 letter requesting extension from Judy Rose
5. June 8, 2017 email requesting extension from Georgia (Gigi) Rodriguez
6. June 9, 2017 email requesting extension from Sherri Clark
7. June 11, 2017 email from Ryan Fleischell
8. June 11, 2017 email from John and Debbie Tripp
9. June 15, 2017 email from Robin James

10. June 21, 2017 letter from Phoebe and Roy Shipley
11. June 24, 2017 email from Sandra Lee
12. June 26, 2017 copy of email from the Tripps to Harford County Bradley Killian
13. July 18, 2017 letter from Judy Rose
14. August 14, 2017 email from Chris Chewey
15. August 22, 2017 letter from Calvin Thompson

Index

Issues Related to Air Quality

1. Air Emissions Analysis
2. Dust and Particulate Matter
3. Crystalline Silica Emissions
4. Cancer and Other Health Concerns
5. Monitoring Requirements
6. Enforcement/Compliance
7. Hours of Operation
8. Public Notice

Other Issues

1. Zoning
2. Truck Traffic
3. Noise
4. Water Supply and Water Pollution Concerns
5. Mining Concerns

Issues Related to Air Quality

1. Air Emissions Analysis

Comment

“...your study was based on conservative estimates of the pollution that this would cause...who did the analysis...can we see it?”

Response

The Department conducted an engineering and air quality review of the information contained in the permit application. The crushing and screening plant must comply with all State imposed emissions limitations and screening levels, as well as National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Department estimated emissions from the plant based on U.S. EPA established emissions factors for crushing and screening plants and manufacturing and U.S.

EPA emissions factors for diesel engines. The Department used a conservative U.S. EPA's SCREEN3 model to project the maximum ground level concentrations from the proposed facility, which were then compared to the screening levels and the NAAQS. The analysis confirmed that emissions from the plant would be in compliance with all applicable State and federal air quality regulations. The modeling analysis, by its nature, is not something that can be included in this document, but the results from the analysis are included in the following three tables:

**TABLE I
PROJECTED MAXIMUM EMISSIONS FROM THE PROPOSED INSTALLATION**

POLLUTANT	PROJECTED MAXIMUM EMISSIONS FROM PROPOSED INSTALLATION	
	(lbs/day)	(tons/year)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	65.89	12.03
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	19.62	3.58
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	60.60	11.06
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	23.62	4.31
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	25.52	4.66

**TABLE II
PROJECTED IMPACT OF EMISSIONS OF CRITERIA POLLUTANTS FROM THE PROPOSED INSTALLATION ON AMBIENT AIR QUALITY**

POLLUTANTS	MAXIMUM OFF-SITE GROUND LEVEL CONCENTRATIONS CAUSED BY EMISSIONS FROM PROPOSED PROCESS (µg/m ³)	BACKGROUND AMBIENT AIR CONCENTRATIONS (µg/m ³)*	NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS (NAAQS) (µg/m ³)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	annual avg. → 11	annual avg. → 33	annual avg. → 100
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8-hour max → 86.4 1-hour max → 123.4	8-hr max. → 2176 1-hr max. → 5267	8-hr max. → 10,000 1-hr max. → 40,000
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	24-hour avg. → 16 annual avg. → 3.2	24-hour avg. → 15 annual avg. → 3.7	24-hour avg. → 366 annual avg. → 78.5
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	24-hr max → 62.3	24-hr max. → 58	24-hr max. → 150

*Background concentrations were obtained from Maryland air monitoring stations as follows:

- NO₂ Annual Avg. → Interstate 95 Welcome Center Howard County
- PM₁₀ → Glen Burnie Monitoring Station in Anne Arundel County
- CO 1-hr max and SO₂ Annual Avg. → 600 Dorsey Avenue in Baltimore County
- SO₂ 24-hr Avg. → Piney Run, Frostburg Reservoir Garrett County
- CO 8-hr max → Old town Fire Station 1100 Hillen Street Baltimore City
- PM₁₀ 24-hr max → Baltimore City Fire Dept.–Truck Company 20 Baltimore City

**TABLE III
PREDICTED MAXIMUM OFF-SITE AMBIENT CONCENTRATIONS FOR
TOXIC AIR POLLUTANTS EMITTED FROM THE PROPOSED INSTALLATION**

TOXIC AIR POLLUTANTS	SCREENING LEVELS ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PROJECTED WORST-CASE FACILITY-WIDE EMISSIONS (lbs/hr)	PREDICTED MAXIMUM OFF-SITE GROUND LEVEL CONCENTRATIONS ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
Crystalline Silica	1-hour→ None 8-hour→ 0.25 Annual→ None	0.00009	1-hour→ None 8-hour→ 0.031 Annual→ None

These tables and additional air quality information related to the analysis are included in the Department's Fact Sheet and Tentative Determination that is available for public review in Docket #01-17 at the following locations:

Maryland Department of the Environment
Air and Radiation Management Administration
1800 Washington Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21230

Abingdon Branch of the Harford County Public Library
2510 Tollgate Road
Abingdon, Maryland 21009
(410) 638-3990

2. Dust and Particulate Matter

Comments

"I believe I heard that a water suppression system would be employed to help keep the dust to a minimal. What is the proposal for how the water be delivered to the crusher?"

"We were told that the EPA and State would mandate regulations for the machine including how much dust would be released into the air. Who verifies those regulations are met? How often?"

"All the concrete dust is blowing around. What, they got pile up down there now 50 feet high. "

"We have witnessed dump trucks leaving without the covers."

"I know the severity of crushing concrete, crushing any type of stone, really. And we have to wear dust masks, respirators..."

Response

Allan Myers MD, Inc. is required to take reasonable precautions to prevent particulate matter (dust) from the crushing and screening operations from becoming airborne. The Air Quality Permit to Construct includes requirements for both initial and continuous compliance as follows:

- A. Within 60 days after achieving the maximum production rate at which the proposed plant will operate, but not later than 180 days of initial startup of the proposed plant, Allan Myers MD, Inc. must conduct opacity observation tests to demonstrate initial compliance with all applicable opacity and fugitive particulate matter requirements. The tests must be conducted in accordance with U.S. EPA established test methods. Allan Myers MD, Inc. must notify the Department of the intended test dates so that an inspector from the Department's Air Quality Compliance Program can observe the tests, and all test results must be submitted to the Department for review and approval.
- B. To demonstrate continuous compliance, Allan Myers MD, Inc. must use wet suppression systems, as needed, to comply with all applicable fugitive opacity and particulate matter emissions standards. The wet suppression systems must be inspected monthly by the company to ensure that water is flowing to the discharge spray nozzles. If water is not flowing properly during an inspection, Allan Myers MD, Inc. must initiate corrective actions within 24 hours and complete these actions as expediently as practical. Allan Myers MD, Inc. must maintain a log of the inspections and any corrective actions taken, and the log must be made available to the Department upon request.
- C. Allan Myers MD, Inc. must also comply with a site-specific Fugitive Dust Plan, reviewed and approved by the Department, which outlines the methods that Allan Myers MD, Inc. will use to control emissions of particulate matter from roadways, stockpiles, and materials handling operations. Allan Myers MD, Inc. must comply with the following requirements of the Department approved Fugitive Dust Plan, unless an alternative plan is approved by the Department.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROCESSING EQUIPMENT AND ASSOCIATED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT

- (a) Spray bars and nozzles shall be kept in good working order and inspected a minimum of once a month.
 - (i) The spray bars shall be operated as per the original equipment manufacturer's recommended water delivery pressure in pounds per square inch and volumetric flow rate in gallons per hour.

- (ii) The spray bar nozzles shall be checked as required by the New Source Performance Standard for Non-Metallic Mineral Processing Plants (40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO) for clogs and cleaned as needed to maintain a uniform spray pattern.
- (b) Accumulated material around the crusher shall be removed on a regular basis. Spillage and residual materials from the process shall be picked up regularly and returned to the raw material stockpiles for reuse.

SITE MAINTENANCE

- (c) Dust in areas where equipment traffic will travel shall be controlled by application of water. Additional water shall be applied to control fugitive dust. In the event alternative dust suppressant aids are used, they will be applied according to the manufacturer's specifications for quantity and frequency.
- (d) The speed of heavy equipment associated with the crushing and screening operation will be limited to no more than 15 miles per hour to minimize airborne dust.
- (e) Dust from stockpiles associated with the crushing and screening operation shall be controlled. The stockpiles are built up as material is conveyed from the crushing equipment, any dust that might rise off the stockpiles shall be controlled with water to prevent dust beyond property lines.
- (f) Complaints by community members can be reported to the site manager and will be reviewed for permit compliance under the permit. Corrective actions will be performed as required.

OTHER

- (g) The loader operator shall be directed to avoid overfilling the bucket of the loader and the feed hopper and to minimize the drop height of the material when loading the feed hopper.
- (h) The stockpiles shall not be worked more than necessary to keep the materials contained within their defined areas. Stockpile heights shall be kept to a minimum.

Separate from the company's obligations with respect to controlling dust, the Department also conducts announced and unannounced inspections to ensure that a company is operating in compliance with air pollution control requirements. If violations occur, appropriate action is taken to bring the facility back into compliance. The type of action taken is a function of the severity and type of violation and several other factors, such as the willfulness of the violation and the

degree of harm to public health or the environment, Enforcement actions can range from the issuance of a notice of violation to the imposition of civil and criminal penalties. Should the public observe dust or any particulate matter leaving the facility's property, a complaint can be made to the Department and necessary follow-up action will be taken.

3. Crystalline Silica Emissions

Comments

"What is mandated to be done at the site to prevent the dust, containing silica, from traveling out into the neighboring community?"

"..the concrete crushing facility would cause silica dust in the air, which is a known toxic air pollutant and causing different things from kidney failure to cancer to lung disease."

"I know about Silica dust... I know that OSHA is getting ready to issue new standards its supposed to be 25, oh jeez, micrograms per.....cubic meter of air...."

Response

The proposed plant is a source of respirable crystalline silica, a State regulated toxic air pollutant. Respirable crystalline silica is a component of the materials that will be processed by the crushing and screening plant. As part of the application review process the Department conducted an ambient impact analysis for emissions of respirable crystalline silica. The analysis was based on projected worst-case hourly emissions of respirable crystalline silica and the worst-case impact (i.e., highest concentration) of those emissions in the ambient air as determined using a U.S. EPA computer screening model. The model projected that the highest concentration in the ambient air beyond the facility's property line would be 0.031 micrograms per cubic meter over an eight-hour period.

The Department's screening level (i.e., acceptable ambient level) for respirable crystalline silica is set at 0.25 micrograms per cubic meter over an eight-hour period which is 1/100th of the allowable worker exposure level established for respirable crystalline silica by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). The projected concentration of respirable crystalline silica from the plant of 0.031 micrograms per cubic meter is well below the screening level for respirable crystalline silica and is in compliance with the State's toxic air pollutant regulations.

4. Cancer and Other Health Concerns

Comments

“..the concrete crushing facility would cause silica dust in the air, which is a known toxic air pollutant and causing different things from kidney failure to cancer to lung disease.”

“How can the state of Maryland allow the placement of a potential hazard in the close vicinity of dozens of children without the appropriate research to rule out any harm to their lungs?”

Response

Except for using the screening process mentioned in the response immediately above as a means to gauge whether silica emissions from the facility present a health risk, it is beyond the scope of this permit to assess health impacts, such as cancer and asthma. As a starting point for this issue, it is suggested that contact be made with the Harford County Health Department and/or the Maryland Department of Health. Both agencies have access to county-wide and sub-county health data that may be useful.

The Maryland Department of Health has a Center for Cancer Prevention and Control, which is responsible for assessing the cancer problem in Maryland. The Maryland Cancer Registry is a Division in the Center:

Maryland Cancer Registry
201 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

https://phpa.health.maryland.gov/cancer/Pages/faq_combined.aspx

The following information is from the Maryland Cancer Registry website:

(a) What are the risk factors for cancer?

The risk of developing cancer increases as we grow older. Most cancers affect adults 40 years of age and older. Among the known risk factors for cancer, tobacco stands out. Cigarette smoking is associated with more than 85% of all lung cancers and with a substantial proportion of cancers of the bladder, mouth and throat, stomach, pancreas and others. Diet is also a risk factor; higher cancer rates are seen in people who eat a diet high in fat and low in fresh vegetables and fruits. It is estimated that diet and tobacco together may account for approximately 2 out of every 3 cancer deaths.

(b) Does the environment cause cancer?

The answer depends in part on how environment is defined. Many cancer researchers use the word to mean hereditary factors, and therefore,

consider things such as tobacco use, diet, alcohol, a woman's age when she has her first child, lifestyle factors, infections and exposure to sunlight. In this very broad sense, it is likely that a large percentage of cancers are environmental in their origin. However, if environment is defined more narrowly as one's surroundings, then the percentage of cancers that can be attributed to the environment is probably small. Most geographic differences in cancer rates seem to result more from the differences between people than from anything in their physical surroundings.

- (c) What if I'm concerned about the number of cancer cases in my neighborhood?

Cancer is common enough that one can expect to see many cases, usually a combination of common and less common types, in any neighborhood. The number of cases that can be expected to occur will depend on the mix of the ages and the ethnic origins of the individuals who live in the neighborhood. For example, in a community of about 1,000 people which includes many young families and persons of all races, one can expect that about 1 to 10 new cases of some type of cancer will be diagnosed every year. In a retirement community of 1,000 people, one can expect many more cases per year, between 12 and 35. The number will also be higher if the neighborhood includes many people with a history of smoking or consuming a lot of alcohol. Because over 50 percent of people diagnosed with cancer will still be alive at least five years after their diagnosis, the number of people in a neighborhood who have ever had cancer will be several times higher than the number of new cases. Cases of cancer among individuals, like many other events, do not necessarily occur in a regular fashion throughout the community; they may appear in little groups among neighboring houses, or people in the same office. This does not necessarily mean that they have the same underlying cause; the grouping may have occurred by chance.

- (d) What if I'm still concerned?

You can call your local health department. The local health department will coordinate with the Cancer Registry staff to evaluate whether the cancers you are concerned about conform to the usual types and numbers that can be expected to occur in the neighborhood, or whether they seem unusual.

In addition, the Maryland Asthma Control Program addresses both adult and childhood asthma. It is located in the Center for Maternal and Child Health at the Maryland Department of Health.

Rachel M. Hess-Mutinda, M.S.W
Asthma Program Administrator
Environmental Health Bureau

Prevention and Health Promotion Administration
Department of Health
201 West Preston Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(410) 767-2196
Rachel.Hess-Mutinda@maryland.gov

The Maryland Asthma Control Program has developed a Maryland Asthma Plan to provide a common vision for individuals, organizations, and communities to address the burden of asthma in Maryland. The Plan serves as a roadmap to implement and evaluate local and statewide actions based on best practices of medical and environmental asthma management. The Program has also published surveillance reports regarding asthma in Maryland. Information about the Asthma Control Program, including links to the most recent reports and statistics, can be found at the following website address:

<https://phpa.health.maryland.gov/mch/pages/asthma.aspx>

The American Lung Association is actively engaged in the fight against lung diseases including asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. Information about emphysema and programs related to air quality and lung diseases may be obtained at the following website address: <http://www.lung.org/>

5. Monitoring Requirements

Comment

“Will the results of mandated monitoring be made available to those in the community?”

Response

Continuous emissions monitors and continuous opacity monitors are used for point sources where emissions are vented through a duct or a stack prior to discharging to the atmosphere. The monitors are installed inside the duct or stack to monitor emissions prior to discharge.

The proposed plant is a fugitive source of dust emissions. Continuous emissions or opacity monitors cannot be used to monitor emissions from this type of source. To demonstrate compliance with applicable opacity and particulate matter requirements, Allan Myers MD, Inc. must conduct initial opacity observation tests as specified in the permit. Subsequent opacity observations will be conducted by inspectors from the Department’s Air Quality Compliance Program to confirm continuous compliance.

Copies of opacity observation test results may be obtained by submitting a Public Information Act (PIA) request with the Department. Information regarding PIA requests can be obtained at the following website:

<http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Marylander/PublicInfoAct/Pages/IntroPIAHome.aspx>

6. Enforcement/Compliance

Comments

“How are they checked? Are they checking themselves or are other people going to be responsible for checking them?”

Response

As noted in an earlier response, the company has certain obligations to perform checks on whether their wet suppression system is properly operating. In addition, the Department possesses the necessary legal tools to require the company to operate properly so as to comply with applicable environmental laws and regulations. Although air quality permits contain conditions requiring companies to conduct monitoring, reporting and record keeping, these are not the only methods by which the Department determines compliance. The Department also conducts announced and unannounced inspections to ensure that a company is operating in compliance with air pollution control requirements. If violations occur, appropriate action is taken to bring the facility back into compliance. The type of action taken is a function of the severity and type of violation and several other factors, such as the willfulness of the violation and the degree of harm to public health or the environment, Enforcement actions can range from the issuance of a notice of violation to the imposition of civil and criminal penalties.

7. Hours of Operation

Comments

There were numerous comments received regarding the hours of operation of the plant and operation during evening, overnight, and weekend hours.

Response

In order to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for particulate matter emissions, the permit to construct limits the crushing and screening plant's operations to no more than 8 hours per calendar day unless Allan Myers MD, Inc. can demonstrate compliance with the standard at other operating conditions. The Department includes operating hour restrictions only when compliance with applicable air quality regulations cannot be achieved without those restrictions. The Department does not have the authority to require or

enforce any other operating hour restrictions such as operating during daytime hours only or operating on weekdays only. These types of restrictions are under the purview of the Harford County Department of Planning and Zoning.

8. Public Notice Questions

Comments

“When is the informational meeting?”

“...we haven't has any real notice in the neighborhood... We don't get the paper. Nobody really seen any signs up at the end of the street to know about it.”

“We were not notified of the informational meeting. We don't subscribe to The Aegis, so we were not notified.”

“Notify everybody within a five-mile radius.”

Response

In accordance with Maryland law, for any permit to construct application subject to public participation, public notices shall be published at least once a week for two consecutive weeks in a daily or weekly newspaper of general circulation in the geographical area in which the proposed facility will be located. In addition, notices shall be posted on the Department's website.

As required by law, all informational meeting and public hearing notices required for this permit application were published in The Aegis, a local twice-weekly newspaper of general circulation in Harford County and on the Department's website. In addition, all notices were sent to the following local elected officials representing the area where the plant will be located: State Senator J.B. Jennings, State Delegates Richard Impallaria, Patrick McDonough, and Kathy Szeliga, Harford County Executive Barry Glassman, Harford County Council President Richard Slutzky, and District B Harford County Councilmember Joseph Woods. During the application review process, notices were also sent to any parties expressing interest in the permit application.

To address concerns from the community regarding lack of adequate notice for the informational meeting for the permit application held on March 15, 2017, Allan Myers MD, Inc. also held a second, voluntary meeting on June 27, 2017 with the community.

Other Issues

1. Zoning

Comments

“The residents of Old Mountain rd Central and Orsburn lane (Connect to each other) would like to have a meeting with zoning if at all possible to discuss this mining pit and the conditions in our community.”

“It’s not zoned heavy industrial, It’s not zoned commercial. It’s zoned agricultural.”

“We know that part of the problem is zoning. What is the subject zoning code?”

“Is all of the 30 acres zoned properly to operate all of the 30 acres?”

Multiple comments concerning negative impact on property values

Multiple comments concerning improper zoning

Response

Local issues such as zoning and land use are under the purview of the zoning authority for Harford County. State law precludes the Department from considering these land use issues, as the Department’s legal authority is limited to determining the air quality impacts a project may have on public health and the environment. As long as the facility meets local zoning and land-use requirements, the Department is obligated to review an air quality permit application for activities related to the facility. The Department is in receipt of a zoning approval document from the Harford County Department of Planning and Zoning for the crushing and screening plant.

2. Truck Traffic

Comments

There were numerous comments received regarding truck traffic through residential neighborhoods, including comments related to traffic congestion, truck routes, truck noise, and safety.

Response

The Department when reviewing an application for an Air Quality Permit to Construct cannot take issues such as truck traffic volume, truck routes, and traffic lights into consideration, and the Department does not have the authority to direct a permit applicant or a state or local agency to address such matters. The Department’s permit application review is based strictly on a project’s air quality

impact. The State Highway Administration and the Harford County Department of Public Works and Transportation can best address traffic related issues. In addition, the Department cannot dictate which routes trucks can take coming to and going from the plant.

To address the truck traffic concerns, Allan Myers MD, Inc has informed the Department that truck traffic during night time hours will be minimized.

3. Noise

Comments

There were numerous comments received regarding noise, including comments related to noise from back up alarms, jake brakes, and noise during night time hours.

Response

As of October 2012, MDE no longer enforces noise regulations. During the 2012 legislative session, House Bill 190 effectively transferred noise enforcement authority to local governments. In Harford County, noise complaints should be referred to the Harford County Sheriff at (410) 692-7880.

To address noise concerns, Allan Myers MD, Inc. has informed the Department that noise will be mitigated as follows:

- A. Truck traffic during night time hours will be minimized.
- B. Truck drivers will be informed to minimize noise from tailgates during dumping operations.
- C. Crushing operations will be optimized during daylight hours and minimized during night time and early morning hours.
- D. Allan Myers MD, Inc. will maintain a berm as a noise barrier for their Jenkins Pit facility.

4. Water Supply and Water Pollution Concerns

Comments

There were numerous comments received regarding water supply and effects on local residential wells and water pollution from the plant's operations.

Response

To address water concerns, Allan Myers MD, Inc. has informed the Department that the water for the wet suppression systems will be from a water truck which will be filled using a local fire hydrant. No well will be drilled, and there will be no impact to the wells in the surrounding area.

The Allan Myers MD, Inc. site has a current General Discharge Permit 10MM9708 issued by the Maryland Department of the Environment for the covered operations of the site. The purpose of the General Discharge Permit is to insure that all waters leaving the site meet or exceed the state standards to protect the waters of the state.

5. Mining Concerns

Comments

“Orsburn and Old Mountain Road Central... both...pits need to be shut down.”

Response

The Department’s Mining Program regulates all mining operations in the State of Maryland. At this time, mining is an allowed operation in this location. There are two surface mine permits associated with the properties off Old Mountain Road and Orsburn Lane:

1. Surface Mine Permit No. 79-SP-0119-2
American Infrastructure-MD, Inc. dba Allan Myers MD, Inc.
Permit Effective Date: November 21, 1978
Permit Expiration Date: March 31, 2020
“The Permittee is authorized to engage in a Surface Mining Operation known as Mountain Materials and Reclamation and located on the south side of Orsburn Lane, 0.4 mile east of Maryland Route 152 in Harford County; as described in the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan dated March 19, 2015 and drawings dated November 18, 2014 and prepared by Frederick Ward Associates, Inc. The permit area shall not exceed 40.8 acres as shown on the aforementioned Mining and Reclamation Plan and drawings.”
2. Surface Mine Permit No. 77- SP-0127-3
Allan Myers MD, Inc.
Permit Effective Date: July 19, 1977
Permit Expiration Date: June 30, 2022
“The Permittee is authorized to engage in a Surface Mining Operation known as Jenkins Pit and located: ½ mile north of I-95 on Route 152, east side of Old Mountain Rd in Harford County; as described in the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan dated January 30, 2017 and drawings dated August 26, 2015 and prepared by Morris & Ritchie Associates, Inc. The permit area shall not exceed 23.76 acres as shown on the aforementioned Mining and Reclamation Plan and drawings.”