

# Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District 160 Governmental Center, Suite 308 Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794 Charlie Crist Governor

Jeff Kottkamp Lt. Governor

Mimi A. Drew Secretary

December 2, 2010

By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested davidr@specblockusa.com

Mr. David Rabold Safety Director Block USA Pensacola Block Plant 2800 North Palafox Street Pensacola, Florida 32501-1437

Dear Mr. Rabold:

On November 19, 2010, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 0330110. 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 items specifically noted in the inspection report.

Please note that Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., requires the owner or operator of any concrete batching plant using an air general permit to test for visible emissions on an annual basis. However, due to the economic climate, the Department recognizes that many permitted facilities have temporarily shut down one or all of their emissions units. Due to this current situation, the Department is not requiring facilities to start-up specifically to perform a compliance test by its due date. Upon recommencing operation, the Department shall be notified as soon as possible, but no later than five calendar days after start-up. Also, the emissions unit(s) shall be tested as soon as practicle, but no later than 30 days after start-up. Notification shall be sent to Department of Environmental Protection, Northwest District Air Program, 160 Governmental Center, Suite 308, Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794.

This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Waltrip at 850/595-0662 or e-mail jennifer.waltrip@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Rick Bradburn

Air Program Administrator

Rich Bradlon

RB/jw/c

Enclosure

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

"More Protection, Less Process" www.dep.state.fl.us



## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)					
AIRS ID#: 0330110 DATE: 11/19/10 ARRIVE: 9:24 AM DEPAR'	Г: <u>9:44 АМ</u>				
FACILITY NAME: PENSACOLA BLOCK PLANT					
FACILITY LOCATION: 2800 N PALAFOX ST					
PENSACOLA 32501-1437					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DAVID RABOLD Email: davidr@specblockusa.com CONTACT NAME: DOUG BUSS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/4/2010 / 6/4/2015 (effective date) (end date)  PHONE: (800)888-9 Mobile: (850)549-8 PHONE: (850)438-6 Mobile:	3338				
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
DADE H. ONCIETE INTRODUCTORY MEETING					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): David Rabold, Safety Director	(check <b>☑</b> only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes:  2. Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID RABOLD?	- ⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still DOUG BUSS? If no, who is?: <u>David Rabold</u>	YesNo YesNo				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Yes				

## Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-block plant,silo(cement)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u> 1. Date of last inspection: <u>3/5/10</u> 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing				
operation?	Yes No			
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>26.01</u> tons/hour				
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  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No			
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE to If not, what was the problem (if known)?	est? 🛚 Yes 🗌 No			
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹 only one			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)			
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?				
<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>				
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?				
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.				
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour				
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and				
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?  2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batch	Yes No			
duration?	Yes No			
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector	which is separate			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) du conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	ration?  Yes  No			
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 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>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>				

## **Facility Section (continued)**

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(ch	neck 🗹	only one
		box f	for each o	question)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:  a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?  b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?  c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	$\boxtimes$	Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
2.	Does this facility include:  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.)?		Yes	⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		Yes	⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple the label of the	ane/yr	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ≤ 1.00°	☐ No
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	iption - 🗌	Yes	☐ No
<u>GI</u>	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one question)
	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?  Does the owner or operator:  a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?  b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all		Yes Yes	⊠ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit? ————————————————————————————————————	S		□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check	•
1. Is the facility: stationary \( \subseteq \); relocatable \( \subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \( \subseteq \) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary, skip the followi</i> )	box for each ing question 2.	• ,
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes	□ No
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900]		□ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busines of Collowing a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation for the appropriate Department of Local American least five business days prior to relocation.	(6)]	□ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pe		NO
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:  a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage of the purpose) if YES, what was the purpose?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	•
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen		question
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions uperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? -  2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	inits or 	⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	_	
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?		⊠ No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?d. A change in ownership?		No     No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee su 30 days prior to the change?	ıbmitted Yes	☐ No
Jennifer Waltrip November 19, 2010		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)  Date of Inspection		
inspector of time (Tease 11mt)		
November 2011		

**COMMENTS:** Department personnel conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance inspection of the Ready Mix USA Block Plant in Escambia County. Mr. David Rabold was available to assist during the inspection. The facility was not in operation at the time of the inspection and according to Mr. Rabold there are no plans to operate the facility at this time, but they would like to keep the permit active. The facility has not been in operation since July 2010.

Please note that Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., requires the owner or operator of any concrete batching plant using an air general permit to test for visible emissions on an annual basis. However, due to the economic climate, the Department recognizes that many permitted facilities have temporarily shut down one or all of their emissions units. Due to this current situation, the Department is

not requiring facilities to start-up specifically to perform a compliance test by its due date. If your facility and/or emission unit(s) are temporarily shut-down, please submit notification to the Department stating the date the facility and/or emission unit(s) temporarily shut-down. Upon recommencing operation, the Department shall be notified as soon as possible, but no later than five calendar days after start-up. Also, the emission unit(s) shall be tested as soon as practicle, but no later than 30 days after start-up. Notification shall be sent to Department of Environmental Protection, Northwest District Air Program, 160 Governmental Center, Suite 308, Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794.