

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

NORTHWEST DISTRICT OFFICE 470 HARRISON AVENUE PANAMA CITY, FLORIDA 32401 RICK SCOTT GOVERNOR

JENNIFER CARROLL LT. GOVERNOR

HERSCHEL T. VINYARD JR. SECRETARY

January 11, 2013

# BY ELECTRONIC MAIL grifsand@fairpoint.net

Mr. Wayne Walden Operations Manager Griffin Sand and Concrete Co., Inc. 20301 Evans Avenue Blountstown, Florida 32424

Dear Mr. Walden:

On November 29, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected the Griffin Sand and Concrete Co., Inc Wewahitchka Concrete Batch Plant ID 0450011. 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 <u>mark.c.sumner@dep.state.fl.us</u>.

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Wilson III, P.E.

**Assistant Director** 

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>)



## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DI ARMS COMPLA		Ϋ́ (CI) □			
AIRS ID#: 0450011 DA	TE: <u>11/29/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>11:30</u>		DEPART:	12:40		
FACILITY NAME: WE	EWAHITCHKA PLANT						
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 1255 CR 386 N						
	WEWAHITCHKA 32	2465-7840					
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: grifsand@fair CONTACT NAME: RI Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC	ICHARD NEWMAN*		Mobile:	(850)674-8664 (850)643-6162 (850)639-2620 (850)247-9353	2 6		
Facility Section							
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
	RODUCTORY MEETING				(check ☑ box for each o	only one question)	
	presentative(s): <u>RICHARD NEV</u>						
	th Mr. Newman and inspected to	·			2012 Method	9 (VE) test.	
2. Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?: <u>NA</u>	resentative still LISA WALDEN	J*?			⊠ Yes	□No	
If different, did the fac 3. Is the facility contact s If no, who is?: <u>NA</u>	cility provide an administrative ustill RICHARD NEWMAN*?	update within 30 days?		N/A	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No	
4. Will facility be conduct If yes, was the compliant	cting VE test(s) during today's in ance authority notified at least 1	nspection?5 days in advance?		N/A	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No	

## Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION				
Date of last inspection: 6/13/2012     Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	⊠ Yes □ Yes □ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No		
DADEN THE DODGEDVATIONS DATE OF ACCUSANCE DATE				
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				
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfin emissions by:</li> </ol>	ed			
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?		□ No		
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to	_			
control emissions?		∐ No		
particulate matter?	☐ Yes	∐ No		
particulate matter from stock piles?	⊠ Yes	☐ 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:				

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? NA

☐ No ☐ No

### **Facility Section (continued)**

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(cł	neck 🔽	only one
				question)
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?	$\boxtimes$	Yes Yes 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? NA		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
4.	$\frac{0 \text{ gal diesel/yr} + 0 \text{ gal gasoline/yr} + 0 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{0 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{0 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} \leq 1.00?$ 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?	npt <u>ion</u>	Yes	□ No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one question)
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
2.	Does the owner or operator:  a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?  b. Enguge that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the six general parmit and complies with all	- 🖂	Yes	☐ No
3.	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?		Yes	☐ 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:		only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting o concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing pla		_
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cemer soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ( <i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c be</i> a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department	Yes	☐ No
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one busine b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five	Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] e business days following a relocation? Yes	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
<ul> <li>c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation I to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at le</li> </ul>		☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a se and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissio a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-rout	ons unit in that separate permit:	□ 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 durat	ion? Yes	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
Note: Relocatable Plant Part 2. (a)(b)(c) and Part 3. (a)(	b) are not applicable for this facility at this time.	
CHANCES		<u> </u>
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ⊻ box for eacl	only one auestion)
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone num		1,
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical re- operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mine	location of the facility or any emissions units or	⊠ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 3 New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	0 days of the change? N/A Yes	□ No
Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?		⊠ No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replac	ement? Yes	⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that d. A change in ownership?		⊠ No ⊠ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new regarded and days prior to the change?		☐ No
C. Mark Sumner	November 29, 2012	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
Mark Sen		
11 cam	November 2013	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

**COMMENTS:** The annual EPA Method 9 visual Emission test for this facility was performed by Lisa Swain of HS&E Resources at the time of this inspection. This facility only has one cement silo. The silo was loaded during the VE test at around 25.5 tons per hour. The emissions for the weigh hopper/batcher are not controlled by the silo dust collector. The weigh hopper/batcher emissions are controlled by a spray bar and a partial enclosure at this facility. A truck was not loaded during this inspection so it is unknown how well the spray bar controls dust emissions at this time. Since the last inspection the spray bar has been repaired and though no batching was observed, the operator did demonstrate the working spray bar. The facility has installed a partial enclosure around the batching area, the enclosure has been repaired and now appears to be maintained as required. With the spray bar and enclosure repaired and maintained in good working condition this should ensure the emissions from the weigh hopper and truck loading are adequately controlled. The facility maintains records for the amount of concrete batched from this facility. The plant itself is powered by the electrical grid. The roads and parking areas are maintained to prevent unconfined emissions by application of water, removal of material, and limited paving. The stock piles are wetted and maintained below the height of the bin blocks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter. At the time of this inspection all the sand and aggregate was observed below the bin block enclosures. Please continue with maintenance and housekeeping to ensure all particulate matter is confined to the property boundary.