

# Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District 160 W. Government Street, Suite 308 Pensacola, Florida 32502-5740 Rick Scott Governor

Jennifer Carroll Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

June 22, 2011

*By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested* NoahM@prm-usa.com

Mr. Noah McBride Operations Manager Pensacola Ready Mix USA Post Office Box 7142 Pensacola, Florida 32534

Dear Mr. McBride:

On June 13, 2011, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 0330098. A copy of the inspection report is enclosed. The inspection and a review of Department records indicate the facility was in compliance at the time of the inspection for those sources specifically listed on the inspection report.

This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program. If you have any questions, please contact Chris Stoll at 850/595-0654 or e-mail christopher.stoll@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Carol Melton

Carol Melton Air Compliance Supervisor

RB/cs/c

Enclosure c: Sue Cummings, Ready Mix USA: suecu@readymixusa.com

www.dep.state.fl.us

and the second se
1
1

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	NUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE ARMS COMPLAINT NC		
AIRS ID#: 0330098 DATE:	<u>6/13/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>10:06 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>10:27 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: WEST S	SIDE PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION:	11575 SORRENTO RD			
	PENSACOLA 32507			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED RI Email: NoahM@readymi: CONTACT NAME: Allen Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:	xusa.com	H MCBRIDE PHONE Mobile: PHONE Mobile:	(850)554-5017 E:	
Facility Section         PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE         SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE       SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
<ul> <li>PART II: <u>ONSITE INTROD</u></li> <li>1. Name(s) of facility represent</li> <li>Brief Notes:</li> </ul>			(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
2. Is the Authorized Represen If no, who is?:	tative still NOAH MCBRID	E?	XesNo	
If different, did the facility 3. Is the facility contact still ? If no, who is?:	provide an administrative up	date within 30 days?	YesNo YesNo YesNo	
4. Will facility be conducting If yes, was the compliance		spection? days in advance?		

#### **Emissions Unit Section**

<u>1 - CONCRETE BATCH PLANT-1 WO SILOS, ONE BAGHOUSE Subject to 5% (</u>		
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1. Date of last inspection:       8/18/2010	(check ☑ box for each	
<ul><li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li><li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li><li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li></ul>		□ No □ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? Operation?</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 3/4/2011</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: <u>3/4/2011</u></li> <li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li> <li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>26.9</u> tons/hour</li> </ul>		☐ No ☐ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> </ul>	Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	Xes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	🗌 Yes	🖂 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loe. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	oaded during ins	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go		🗌 No
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching</li> </ol>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
duration?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector wh	ich is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust c conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	on? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ol> <li>Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?</li> </ol>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	🗌 Yes	No
<ul><li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li><li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	•
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	X Yes X Yes	I No No No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🛛 No
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gen permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities?		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal propaga275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propaga		)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consu for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for each	only one n question)
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowe the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?		🖂 No
<ol> <li>Does the owner or operator:</li> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> </ol>	Xes	
<ul> <li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with al terms and conditions of the air general permit?</li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, and a second second</li></ul>	Xes	🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air gene permit and Department rules?	eral	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check ☑ box for each	
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stat concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If o</i>			• ´
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>		🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Loc e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day pri b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificati</li> </ul>	or to changing location?		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification	days following a relocation? on Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	- 🗌 Yes	No
<ul><li>to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five bu</li><li>3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air</li></ul>			∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose If YES, what was the purpose?	that separate permit: se (i.e, there is no repeated usage		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		🗌 Yes 🗍 Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	only one
Administrative Changes:		box for each	•
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ol>	f the facility or any emissions ur trative change at the facility?	its or 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been</li> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ul>		🗌 Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul><li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substan</li><li>d. A change in ownership?</li></ul>	tially different?	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	🛛 No 🛛 No
<ol> <li>If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ol>			🗌 No
Chris Stoll	6/13/2011		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
/s/	June 2012		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins	spection	

#### **COMMENTS:**

On June 13, 2011, a routine unannounced air compliance inspection was preformed at the Pensacola Ready Mix Sorrento Road concrete batch plant. After observing the loading of a concrete truck, I met with the facility manager Mr. Allen Duncan. To control fugitive dust from the unpaved site, water is applied on a daily basis and to prevent wind blown emissions, the height of the aggregate in the storage bins are maintained below the tops of the walls.

The annual visible emissions test was performed by Pensacola P.O.C. on March 4, 2011. During the thirty minute test there were no emissions observed. The test report indicates that two tankers were unloading at a rate of 26.9 tons per hour; however, the test report does not indicate whether or not batching occurred during emission testing.

Rule 62-296.414(3)(c), Florida Administrative Code, states that visible emissions tests of silo dust collector exhaust points shall be conducted while loading the silo at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate. The minimum loading rate shall be 25 tons per hour unless such rate is unachievable in practice. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are also controlled by the silo dust collector, the batching operation shall be in operation during the visible emissions test. The batching rate during the emissions test shall be representative of the normal batching rate and duration. Each test report shall state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing and, if applicable, whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing.

Unchecked boxes on the above checklist are not applicable at the time of inspection.