

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 1310256. 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,

Carol Melton

Air Compliance Supervisor

Carre Melton

CM/jw/c

Enclosure



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| | ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) | COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA | | Y(CI) | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| AIRS ID#: 1310256 DATE: <u>1/18/12</u> ARRIVE: <u>10:45 AM</u> DEPART: <u>11:45 AM</u> | | | | | | |
| FACILITY NAME: DEF | FUNIAK SPRINGS PAVER PL | ANT | | | | |
| FACILITY LOCATION | : 28 GENE HURLEY DR | | | | | |
| | DEFUNIAK SPRINGS | 32435-4739 | | | | |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: davidr@specb CONTACT NAME: RU Email: rustyc@specb. ENTITLEMENT PERIC | JSTY CRAIG lockusa.com | | PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: | (850)549-8338 | | |
| Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) | | | | | | |
| ⊠ IN COMPLIANC | CE MINOR Non-COMP | PLIANCE SIG | NIFICANT | Non-COMPLIA | NCE | |
| | | | | | | - |
| | resentative(s): Rusty Craig | | | | check 🗹 ox for each | only one question) |
| Brief Notes: Sue Cum | mings, Environmental Coordina | ator, is to be copied or | all corresp | ondence | | |
| 2. Is the Authorized Repro | esentative still DAVID RABOL | D? | | D | ⊠ Yes | □No |
| If different, did the faci 3. Is the facility contact st If no, who is?: | lity provide an administrative uptil RUSTY CRAIG? | pdate within 30 days? | | [[| ☐ Yes ☑ Yes | □No □No |
| | ting VE test(s) during today's in nce authority notified at least 15 | | | | Yes Yes | ⊠No □No |

${\bf Emissions~Unit~Section} \\ {\bf \underline{5-Concrete~Batch~Plant-3} silosw/bhouses, tumbler, mixerw/dust coll~subject~to~Reasonable~Precautions} \\$

| PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION | | only one question) |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Date of last inspection: 11/16/10 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? \[\Delta / \text{N/A} \] 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 | only one question) |
| Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by: a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the | | |
| a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one of more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? | | □ No□ No |
| | | ☐ No |
| b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? | X 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)? | | ☐ No ☐ No |

Facility Section (continued)

| CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY | | only one question) | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 gene 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)? | Yes - Yes - Yes | No No No No No No | | | | |
| gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal prop 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propar | $\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$ | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| <u></u> | | | | | | |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS | (check ☑ 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? Does the owner or operator: | Yes | ⊠ No | | | | |
| a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all | | ☐ No | | | | |
| terms and conditions of the air general permit? | | ☐ No | | | | |
| to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules? | X Yes | ☐ No | | | | |

| RELOCATABLE PLANT: | (check v box for each | only one |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|
| 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</i> 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and | ; question 2 | .) |
| soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? | Yes | □ No |
| (If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.) | 105 | 110 |
| 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? | Yes | □ No |
| b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification of DEP No. 62-210.900(6 | | |
| to the Department or Local Air Program no later that Ey by following a relocation? | Yes | □ No |
| c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Fac Styring 1980 (6) | o] | |
| to the appropriate Departm () all the part at least five business days prior to relocation? - | Yes | ☐ No |
| c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Factory at least five business days prior to relocation? - 3. If the relocatable plant was construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permits a facility with a separate air operation per | nit, | |
| 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) | ? Yes | ☐ 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? | - Yes | ☐ No |
| If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? | - Yes | ☐ No |
| | | |
| | | |
| <u>CHANGES</u> | | only one |
| Administrative Changes: | box for each | n question) |
| 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representations. | ive not | |
| associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions uni | | |
| operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? | | ⊠ No |
| 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? | | □ No |
| New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: | | |
| 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been | | |
| a. Installation of any new process equipment? | Yes | ⊠ No |
| b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? | - TYes | No |
| c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? | - Tyes | ⊠ No |
| d. A change in ownership? | | No No |
| an an annual of the second of | | |
| 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub | | |
| 30 days prior to the change? | - Yes | ☐ No |
| | | |
| Jennifer Waltrip January 18, 2012 | | |
| Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection | | |
| I 2012 | | |
| January 2012 | | |
| Approximate Date of Next Insp | pection | |
| COMMENTS: Department personnel conducted an unannounced annual air compliance inspection of Ro | eady Mix U | SA DeFuniak |
| Springs Paver Plant on January 18, 2012. Mr. Rusty Craig and Mr. Bubba Craig were available to assist d | uring the in | spection. The |
| facility was in operation at the time of the inspection and no emissions were noted coming from the main | building. N | o silos were |
| loaded and the tumbler was not in operation. | | |
| | | |
| The most recent visible emissions test was conducted on January 4, 2011, on three baghouses and two dus | | |
| emission point reported 0% opacity and the facility was operating under normal conditions. The testing for | or calendar y | ear 2012 had |
| not been conducted at the time of the inspection. Testing is to be completed prior to December 31, 2012. | | |
| | | |
| The facility was well-maintained and all records used to ensure ongoing compliance were available for rev | | |
| each baghouse is checked at least every month while being loaded to ensure there are no visible emissions | | |
| performed on each baghouse by an outside provider on an annual basis. The yard is swept and watered as | needed to p | revent any |
| fugitive emissions. | | |