

Florida Department of **Environmental Protection**

Jeff Kottkamp

Lt. Governor

Charlie Crist

Governor

Michael W. Sole Secretary

Tallahassee Branch Office 630-3 Capital Circle Northeast Tallahassee, Florida 32301

December 30, 2008

SENT VIA E-MAIL ScottC@andersoncolumbia.com Victor.keisker@andersoncolumbia.com keister@comcast.net

Scott R. Cleveland, P.G. Environmental Manager A Materials Group, Inc. Post Office Box 1829 Lake City, Florida 32056-1829

Dear Mr. Cleveland:

A Department representative inspected your facility to determine compliance with the Air Quality Operating Permit. The Air Program identification number for this facility is 7775067. Your facility permit expires on May 15, 2013. This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program.

Based on the facility inspection results, the Tallahassee Branch Office reported a status of In-Compliance for your facility.

Note that your facility compliance status may be subject to further review by the District Program Office.

The assistance you provided is appreciated. You are encouraged to review the enclosed inspection checklist and its comments section. If you have any questions, your local contact is Tracy White at (850) 488-3704 or tracy.a.white@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Marlene Castellanos

Marlane Castellanos Branch Manager

MC/tw **Enclosures**

Rick Bradburn, FDEP, Pensacola

Mary Beth Curle, FDEP Erica Mitchell, FDEP



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

RE-I	NUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCO	VERY (CI)		
	NSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT	NO:		
AIRS ID#: 7775067 DATE: 1	<u>12/17/2008</u>	ARRIVE:	DEPART:		
FACILITY NAME: AMGI P	LANT #22				
FACILITY LOCATION:	1800 BRICKYARD RD I	3			
	MIDWAY 32343				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED RE	PRESENTATIVE: BRIA	N SCHREIBER PHO	NE: (386)752-7585		
CONTACT NAME:		РНО	NE:		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:	5/15/2008 / 5/15/2013 (effective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTION COM	IPLIANCE STATUS (che	eck 🗹 only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPL	LIANCE SIGNIFIC	ANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: TESTING/RECOR		ENTS – Rule 62-296.414,	F.A.C.		
(check ☑ appropriate box)	(es))				
Stack Emissions	ests conducted during this s	ite visit according to EPA 1	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
 Were visible emissions t 	 Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?				
62-297, F.A.C.)?		1 .1 1 1	□Yes ⊠ No		
62-297, F.A.C.)?2. Are emissions from silo	s, weigh hoppers (batchers),	and other enclosed storage	and conveying equipment		
62-297, F.A.C.)?2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the e	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible em s tests of the silo dust collec	nissions to 5 percent opacity tor exhaust points was the l	e and conveying equipment y?		
 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent silos. 3. During visible emissions at a rate that is represent 	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible em s tests of the silo dust collec ative of the normal silo load	nissions to 5 percent opacity tor exhaust points was the l ling rate, or at least at the m	e and conveying equipment /?		
 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unach 4. Are emissions from the emissions 	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emeas tests of the silo dust collectative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?weigh hopper (batcher) open	nissions to 5 percent opacity stor exhaust points was the ling rate, or at least at the management of the silon controlled by the silon	e and conveying equipment y?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unach the emissions from the to this question is "Yes"	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emeas tests of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity for exhaust points was the liding rate, or at least at the marriage ration controlled by the silotons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a	e and conveying equipment y?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unached. Are emissions from the to this question is "Yes" skip 4.a) and 4.b) and controlled and was the batching open.	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emergence of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity tor exhaust points was the l ding rate, or at least at the m ration controlled by the silo ons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a	e and conveying equipment /?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos controlled to the extent of the ex	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emergence of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity tor exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the meration controlled by the silo ons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a he visible emissions test?—ng rate representative of the	e and conveying equipment y?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unached. Are emissions from the to this question is "Yes" skip 4.a) and 4.b) and control of the emissions from the enduration?	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emeasters of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity at or exhaust points was the ling rate, or at least at the marriage ration controlled by the silo ons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a second rate representative of the second rate representative of the second rate controlled by a dust	e and conveying equipment y?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unached. Are emissions from the to this question is "Yes" skip 4.a) and 4.b) and control and the emissions from the visible enduration?	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emeasters of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity for exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the marriagn controlled by the silo ons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a second rate representative of the silo on are controlled by a dust is tests of the weigh hopper	e and conveying equipment y?		
62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silor controlled to the extent of the extent of the extent of the extent of the emissions at a rate that is represent unless such rate is unached. Are emissions from the to this question is "Yes" skip 4.a) and 4.b) and control and the emissions from the visible enduration?	s, weigh hoppers (batchers), necessary to limit visible emeasters of the silo dust collect ative of the normal silo load nievable in practice?	nissions to 5 percent opacity for exhaust points was the lading rate, or at least at the marriagn controlled by the silo ons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a second rate representative of the silo on are controlled by a dust is tests of the weigh hopper	e and conveying equipment y?		

PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued) (check ☑ appropriate box(es)	
Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.) 1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)	□No
New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 2. Did this facility demonstrate: a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?	
Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? Yes [] No
Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.) 4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed?] No
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary □; 2) a relocatable □; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check ☑ only one box.) 2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.) a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?————————————————————————————————————] No] No] No
 (check ☐ appropriate box(es)) Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☐; 2) a relocatable ☐; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable ☐ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check ☐ only one box.) If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)] No] No] No

	REMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))	,
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.) 1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching placemissions by:	
 a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, 2) application of water or environmentally safe 	s, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following: reas, stock piles, and yards? de dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
 3) removal of particulate matter from roads and re-entrainment, and from building or work ar 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation particulate matter from stock piles? 	d other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to treas to reduce airborne particulate matter? Yes No of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of No
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to m	nitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? \overline{\
 b) alterations to existing process equipment with c) replacement of existing equipment substantial recent notification form? d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62) 	
Tracy White	12/17/2008
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
1 rues Whire	6-12 months
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
COMMENTS:	
I met with Ricky Goldwire, Plant Operator. Mr. Goldwire no 12/04/08 receipt from Filter Kleen for recent maintenance wo	oted that the baghouses were recently maintained, and he produced a ork on the baghouses.
No apparent changes or modifications to equipment were no yard emissions were noted.	oted. No trucks or silos were being loaded during the inspection. No

The last compliance test was performed on 5/15/2008.