

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District Office 2353 Jenks Avenue Panama City, Florida 32405-4389 Rick Scott Governor

Jennifer Carroll
Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

February 24, 2012

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL ssimonsen@argos-us.com

Mr. Steve Simonsen Argos USA 12735 Morris Road Extension, Suite 300 Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

Dear Mr. Simonsen:

On February 15, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected the Argos Ready Mix, LLC – Panama City Concrete Batch Plant in Bay County ID 0050066. 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 C. Mark Sumner at 850/767-0046, or by email at mark.c.sumner@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Wilson III, P.E.

Panama City Branch Administrator

CDW/ms

Enclosure

c: Ms. Mary Beth Curle, FDEP Pensacola (<u>mary.beth.curle@dep.state.fl.us</u>)

Ms. Carol Melton, FDEP Pensacola (<u>carol.melton@dep.state.fl.us</u>)

Mr. Andy Workman, Argos (<u>aworkman@argos-us.com</u>)



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPEC	TION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	_	AINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)		
AIRS ID	#: 0050066 DA	TE: <u>2/15/2012</u>	ARRIVE:	11:34	DEPART: <u>1</u>	12:28	
FACILI	TY NAME: PA	NAMA CITY CONCRETI	E PLANT				
FACILI	TY LOCATION	N: 1604 MAPLE AVE	E				
		PANAMA CITY	32405-6048				
Emai CONTA Emai	l: ssimonsen@a CT NAME: A l: aworkman@a	ANDY WORKMAN argos-us.com	/2016	SEN PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(678)746-2184 (770)356-7285 (850)235-9600		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
1. Name	e(s) of facility rep	presentative(s): Andy Work	kman_	equested records.	ŀ	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Authorized Rep who is?: NA	resentative still STEVE SIN	MONSEN?			⊠ Yes	□No
3. Is the	Ferent, did the facility contact who is?: NA	cility provide an administra still ANDY WORKMAN?	tive update within	30 days?	N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
		cting VE test(s) during toda ance authority notified at le				Yes Yes	⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section

1 - CCB Plant-silo(1-120Tsplit-cment/f-ash&1-30Tcement)w/cent.dc subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
Date of last inspection: 2/9/2011 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?		☐ 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 1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinentissions by:	ined	
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	X Yes	□ No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	X Yes	□ No□ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	🛚 Yes	☐ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: (<u>NA</u>)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? C. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? <u>NA</u>	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			only one
		box for each	
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?	⊠ Yes	 No 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.)?		⊠ 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?		⊠ 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 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 + MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM gal		?
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?	ption - Yes	☐ No
	Note: Permit Eligibility Part 3. $(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)$ and Part 4 are not applicable for this facility at this	s time.	
GF	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	2
2.	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 - Yes - Yes	NoNoNo
	permit and Department rules?	- X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹 c	
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing p	of both stationary and relocatable	laconon)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cemes soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c b	Yes below.)	☐ No
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Departs e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one businb. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation	ness day prior to changing location? Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at 1	Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a s and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissi	ions unit in that separate permit:	_
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-rou If YES, what was the purpose?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how		☐ No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in dura	\ Yes	□ No
Note: Relocatable Plant Part 2. (a)(b)(c) and Part 3. (a)		∐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ c box for each q	•
<u>Administrative Changes</u> : 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the state of th		_l uestion)
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical re	relocation of the facility or any emissions units or	
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership	30 days of the change? N/A Yes	∐ No ∐ No
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 repla	cement? Yes	⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment thad. A change in ownership?	·	⊠ No □ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new range of the change?		☐ No
C. Mark Sumner	2/15/2012	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
Mark Sen		
///ask see	February 2013	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: Mr. Andy Workman the plant manager was on site at the time of this inspection.

The last VE test for this facility was performed on 7/13/2011; it was received by the Department on 7/21/2011; and the test reported a 0 % opacity.

According to the operator to ensure the dust collector operates as designed the maximum loading pressure of the silos is 10 PSI.

Emissions from the batcher are controlled by the silo dust collector. The batcher is equipped with a partial enclosure curtain and there are two vacuum inlets to draw dust to the collector. No activities were occuring at this plat at the time of this inspection, however, the rusted aggregate bins have been replaced, and the worn batching shroud has been replaced.

Records are maintained for the fuel consumption by the delivery trucks and materials processed on a monthly basis. This plant has been idle for most of the past year and very little material has been used. No fuel is used to operate the plant since it is run entirely off the electricity grid.

Approximately 50% of the facility has been paved, and the facility is washed down weekly during times it is operating to control dust. A log of the wash downs is maintained along with a weekly baghouse inspection/maintenance log.

The Stock piles are maintained below the height of the binblocks to prevent wind entrainment of particulate matter.