

# 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 20, 2012

*By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested* dellis@readymixusa.com

Ms. Desiree Ellis Environmental Coordinator Ready Mix USA LLC 2570 Ruffner Road Birmingham, Alabama 35210

Dear Ms. Ellis:

On June 19, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Program conducted a compliance assistance visit at your facility, ID 1130028. A report of the visit is enclosed.

As a reminder, when conducting the visible emissions test you must record the batching rate during the test in order to comply with testing requirements. Rule 62-296.414(3)(c), Florida Administrative Code, states that 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.

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,

Carre Melton

Carol Melton Air Compliance Supervisor

CM/jw/c Enclosure

www.dep.state.fl.us

	-	L MOIECIO	1	-
er age		VA	C.	1
F	LOR	IDA		

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:       ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)       COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)         RE-INSPECTION (FUI)       ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 1130028 DATE: <u>6/19/12</u>	ARRIVE: <u>4:45 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>4:45 PM</u>		
FACILITY NAME: MIDWAY PLANT				
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 1623 OCEAN BREEZE	, LN			
GULF BREEZE 3256	1			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: NOA Email: NoahM@readymixusa.com CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/14/2010 / 1/14/2015	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(850)477-2899 (850)554-5017		
(effective date) (end date)				
F	Facility Section			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)         ☑ IN COMPLIANCE       ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE       ☑ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING         1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):		(check $\square$ only one box for each question)		
Brief Notes: <u>No representative onsite</u>				
<ol> <li>Is the Authorized Representative still NOAH MCBRIE If no, who is?:</li> </ol>	DE?	XesNo		
If different, did the facility provide an administrative up 3. Is the facility contact still ? If no, who is?:				

#### **Emissions Unit Section** 4 –Cement Concrete Batch Plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>		
	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: <u>8/16/11</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	D 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? X N/A	Yes	No
d. Date of last VE test: $8/16/11$		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Yes	No No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	No No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>26.75</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?	Yes Yes	🛛 No 🖾 No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	Xes Yes	No No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		
	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?		🛛 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	No No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.	×7	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	No
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 cor	nducted at a r	ate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not load		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		
<ul><li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li><li>f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour</li></ul>	Yes	pection.
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li> <li>f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour</li> <li>g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	pection.
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	pection.
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes Yes	pection.
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>i.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>e and</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	pection.
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	$\begin{array}{c c} Yes \\ \hline Yes \\ l. \\ \hline Yes \\ e and \\ \hline Yes \\ es \\ \end{array}$	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes A Yes e and Yes es is separate	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes Yes e and Yes es is separate ector	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes Yes e and Yes es is separate ector Yes	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>i.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>e and</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>es</li> <li>is separate</li> <li>is separate</li> <li>ctor</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>S.</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	Yes Yes Yes e and Yes es is separate ector Yes s.	pection. No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>i.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>e and</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>es</li> <li>is separate</li> <li>octor</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>s.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	pection. No No No No No No No No No No
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>i.</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>e and</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>es</li> <li>is separate</li> <li>is separate</li> <li>ctor</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>S.</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	pection. No No No No No No No No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFI	RMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	question)
a. 10 b. 25	this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?	· 🛛 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
a. An units Rule	this facility include: y emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		🛛 No
permi	y emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general tand this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		🛛 No
a. 275 b. 23, c. 44 d. 1.3	total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: 5,000 gallons of diesel fuel? 000 gallons of gasoline? million standard cubic feet on natural gas? million gallons of propane?		□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
275,0	gal diesel/yr +gal gasoline/yr +MM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal prop00 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		)?
4. Has the for ear	he owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumers of consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption 🗌 Yes	🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for each	•
1. 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
<ol> <li>Does the owner or operator:</li> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> <li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its clicibility to use the sin general normalise with all</li> </ol>	- Xes	□ No
<ul><li>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?</li></ul>		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No

	ELOCATABLE PLANT: Is the facility: stationary 🖾; relocatable 🗌; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable 🗌 concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary, skip the following</i>	box f	or each	only one question)
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	- 🗆	Yes	🗌 No
	<ul><li>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?</li><li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]</li></ul>		Yes	No No
	<ul> <li>to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation?</li> <li>c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]</li> <li>to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?</li> </ul>	)]	Yes Yes	No No
3.	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per 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 If YES, what was the purpose?	)?	Yes	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 Administrative Changes:	(check 🗹 box for each	•
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized reassociated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the face</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ol>	ssions units or cility? 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been <ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate 30 days prior to the change?		No

Jennifer Waltrip

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

#### June 19, 2012

Date of Inspection

June 2013

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** On June 19, 2012, Department personnel attempted to conduct a compliance assistance visit at Pensacola Ready Mix in Santa Rosa County. The facility was not in operation and no one was onsite. Department records indicate compliance with the testing requirements and the site appears to be well maintained. A visible emissions test has not yet been conducted for the current calendar year.

As a reminder, when conducting the visible emissions test you must record the batching rate during the test in order to maintain compliance with testing requirements. Rule 62-296.414(3)(c), Florida Administrative Code, states that 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.