

# 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

February 28, 2012

By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested dfales@preferredmaterials.com

Mr. Darryl Fales, President Preferred Materials Inc. 25061 Old US 41 South Bonita Springs, Florida 34135

Dear Mr. Fales:

On February 22, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 7770043. 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.

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,

Carol Melton

Air Compliance Supervisor

Carre Melton

CM/jw/c

Enclosure

c: Erin Zimmet, Old Castle Materials: erin.zimmet@oldcastlematerials.com Court Wyrick, Preferred Materials: cwyrick@preferredmaterials.com



### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)   RE-INSPECTION (FUI)   ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 7770043 DATE: <u>2/22/12</u> ARRIVE: <u>1:50PM</u> DEPART: FACILITY NAME: FORT WALTON BEACH PLANT	2:15 PM				
FACILITY LOCATION: 1787 FIM BLVD  FORT WALTON BEACH 32547  OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DARRYL FALES Email: dfales@preferredmaterials.com CONTACT NAME: JAMES SWEDENBURG Email: j.swedenburg@preferredmaterials.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/6/2011 / 6/6/2016 (effective date) (end date)	11				
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Kevin Harrington and Dan Swafford  Brief Notes:	(check only one box for each question)				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still DARRYL FALES? ————————————————————————————————————	<ul><li></li></ul>				

## Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-Ssilow/BHse,Nsilow/DC,whpprB-hse,ld-outw/sprayring subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION - CEMENT SILO BAGHOUSE - S SILO	(check 🗹	only one
		only one
1. Date of last inspection: <u>5/9/11</u>	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		No No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
operation? 🔯 N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 3/16/11		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	=	☐ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>52.3</u> tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	□ <b>v</b>	□ NI.
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	∐ Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	∐ Yes	⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	<b>-</b> -	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION - FLY ASH SILO BAGHOUSE - N SILO		
	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: 5/9/11	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	_	_
operation? 🔯 N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 3/16/11		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	⊠ Yes	No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		☐ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 53.9 tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
	Yes	□ No
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A		∐ No ⊠ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	N 37	□ N7
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION – WEIGH HOPPER BAGHOUSE	(ala a ala 📈	
		only one
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{5/9/11}{}$	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	_	_
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 9/14/11		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Yes	☐ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		No No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? n/a 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	⊠ Yes	□ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	103	∠J 140
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	∠ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √ √	L 140
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment		(check ☑ only one box for each 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></ul>	Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	☐ No
	If YES, then continue on to questions g.1) – g.3) below. If answer NO, then skip g.1) – g.3) and go to  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 batching rate	Yes	□ No
	duration?	- Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.</li> </ul>	n is separate	
	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? minut		☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	☐ Yes	No No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
	b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes	□ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		☐ 1NO

### **Facility Section (continued)**

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each	•
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?	Xes	☐ 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.)?  If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		⊠ 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 fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	-	No No No No No
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM g	$\frac{\text{ane/yr}}{\text{ne/yr}} \le 1.00$	)?
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?		□ No
CENERAL COMPUTIONS		
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	•
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?	Yes	⊠ No
Does the owner or operator:     a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		□ No
b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?		☐ No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		□ No

R	ELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	only one
1.	Is the facility: stationary □; relocatable ⊠; or consisting of bot concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		box for each g question 2.	• /
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement an soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		- Yes	⊠ No
	<ul> <li>(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.</li> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department of e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business of b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notify to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five bused.</li> <li>c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notify to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at the communication.</li> </ul>	or Local Air Program by telephone, ay prior to changing location?	5)] -	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
3.	If the relocatable plant was co-located in a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is an included as an emissions with a was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine process. If YES, what was the purpose?	nit in that separate permit:		☐ No
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes Yes	□ No □ No
<u>C</u> :	<u>HANGES</u>			only one
1. 2. No	dministrative Changes:  Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocat operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor ad If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days are wor Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	ion of the facility or any emissions un ministrative change at the facility?	its or - Yes	No
3.	Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is su d. A change in ownership?	nt?bstantially different?		<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
4				
	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?		mitted -	□ No
	30 days prior to the change?	·		
	30 days prior to the change? nnifer Waltrip	February 22, 2012		

**COMMENTS:** On February 22, 2012, Department personnel conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance inspection of Preferred Materials in Okaloosa County. The Department would like to thank Mr. Kevin Harrington and Mr. Dan Swafford for their assistance during the inspection.

During the inspection a tanker was unloading fly ash to the silo and a truck was loaded with concrete. No emissions were noted. A new baghouse was installed for the weigh hopper in 2011. Initial testing was conducted on September 14, 2011 and indicated compliance with permit limits.