

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

January 23, 2012

By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested suecu@readymixusa.com

Mr. Marc Bryant Tyson, President Ready Mix USA, LLC Post Office Box 101868 Birmingham, Alabama 32510

Dear Mr. Tyson:

On January 18, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 1310011. 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 jennifer.waltrip@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Carre melton

Carol Melton Air Compliance Supervisor

CM/jw/c

Enclosure

www.dep.state.fl.us

Course.
- 1
1

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 1310011 DA		ARRIVE: <u>10:45 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:45 AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: DF	EFUNIAK SPRINGS BLOCK PLA	ANT	
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 91 GENE HURLEY RD		
	DEFUNIAK SPRINGS	32435-4736	
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: davidr@spect CONTACT NAME: JI Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC	IM MCNEELY	/ID RABOLD PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(850)549-8338
	Fa	acility Section	
PART I: INSPECTION	N COMPLIANCE STATUS (che	eck 🗹 only one box)	

_	_	
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check 🗹	only one
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Bubba Craig_BubbaCraig@specblockusa.com</u>	box for each	
Brief Notes: Sue Cummings, Environmental Coordinator is to be copied on all correspondence		
 Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID RABOLD? If no, who is?: 	Yes Yes	□No
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still JIM MCNEELY? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?	Yes Yes	⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section

		Linnt	
PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1	$D_{1} = (1 - 1)^{1/1} = (1 -$	box for each	question)
	Date of last inspection: <u>11/16/10</u> Part Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
Ζ.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	Yes	□ No
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	\square Yes	
	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		🖾 No
	operation? N/A	Yes	□ No
	d. Date of last VE test: 6/15/11		
	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?		\square No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>27.5</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? \square N/A	Yes	□ No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	
	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?	X Yes	No No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PA	RT II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	Yes	🛛 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.		
	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 co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \Box N/A – silo not load		spection.
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		^
		Yes	No No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		No No
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	^
	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 to	\Box Yes <i>h</i> .	No No
	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 to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes<i>h.</i>Yes	No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1) – g.3) below. If answer NO, then skip g.1) – g.3) and go to</i> 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 Yes <i>h</i>. Yes te and 	No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> 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 duration?	☐ Yes <i>h</i> . ☐ Yes te and - ☐ Yes	No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes <i>h.</i> ☐ Yes te and - ☐ Yes tes	No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching raduration?	 Yes Yes Yes te and Yes Yes tes is separate 	No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> g.1) – g.3) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> g.1) – g.3) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 Yes Yes Yes te and Yes tes n is separate ector 	 No No No No No
	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> g.1) – g.3) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> g.1) – g.3) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 Yes h. Yes te and Yes tes n is separate ector Yes 	No No
2.	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 Yes h. Yes te and Yes tes n is separate ector Yes 	 No No No No No
2.	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes te and ☐ Yes tes n is separate ector ? ☐ Yes es. ☐ Yes 	 No No No No No
2.	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>/ - <i>g.3</i>/ <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>/ - <i>g.3</i>/ <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 Yes h. Yes te and Yes tes is separate ector Yes ector Yes es. 	 No No No No No No No No
2.	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>) – <i>g.3</i>) <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes te and ☐ Yes tes n is separate ector <i>P</i> ☐ Yes es. ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes 	 No No No No No No No
2.	 g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions g.1</i>/ - <i>g.3</i>/ <i>below. If answer NO, then skip g.1</i>/ - <i>g.3</i>/ <i>and go to</i> Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	 ☐ Yes <i>h</i>. ☐ Yes te and ☐ Yes tes n is separate ector <i>P</i> ☐ Yes es. ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes 	 □ No

Emissions Unit Section

3 - CCB Plant-block plant mixer w/individual baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	•
 Date of last inspection: <u>11/16/10</u> Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 	🗌 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each	•

1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined
	emissions by:

 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more o 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary control emissions?	to	D No
 a) volue of particulate index inter from forces and other particulate and other particulate matter? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainmen particulate matter from stock piles?	nt of	🗌 No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck	c? 🗌 Yes	No No
 2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 		D No No

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? 	🛛 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
 Does this facility include: 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? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 		🛛 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/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal propriation275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propriation		0?
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?	umption 🗌 Yes	No 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
 Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its clicibility to use the sin general normalise with all 	- Xes	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?3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access		🗌 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

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ box for each	•
1. 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 and stationary skip the following stating stationary skip the following stationary skip the follow</i>		•
 Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		🗌 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. 62-210.9] 	Yes	No No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.90 to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation	00(6)]	No No
 If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation 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 u 	<u> </u>	🗌 No
If YES, what was the purpose? 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	□ No □ No
·		
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	•
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized repress associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emission operations 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?	box for each entative not s units or ? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	•
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized repress associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emission operations 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?	box for each entative not s units or ? UYes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized repress associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emission operations 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?	box for each entative not s units or ? UYes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: On January 18, 2012, Department personnel conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance inspection of Ready Mix USA DeFuniak Springs Block Plant. Mr. Bubba Craig and Mr. Rusty Craig were available to assist during the inspection. The facility was in operation at the time of the inspection and no emissions were noted from the main building. The silo was being loaded and no emissions were noted from the baghouse.

The facility was well-maintained and all records used to ensure ongoing compliance were available for review. Records show that each baghouse is checked at least every month while being loaded to ensure there are no visible emissions. Maintenance is performed on each baghouse by an outside provider on an annual basis. The yard is swept and watered as needed to prevent any fugitive emissions.