

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District 160 Governmental Center Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794 Charlie Crist Governor Jeff Kottkamp Lt. Governor

Michael W. Sole Secretary

May 29, 2009

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL aperfectmix@bellsouth.net

Mr. William D. Powell, Owner A Perfect Mix Post Office Box 91 Cantonment, Florida 32533

Dear Mr. Powell:

On March 5, 2009, Department representatives with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 0330280. 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 850/595-8300, extension 1222 or via e-mail at: Jennifer.Waltrip@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Erica Mitchell

Air Compliance Supervisor

EM/jw/c

Enclosure

c: Gary Given, Akon Construction (ggiven@akon-al.com)



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL	L (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVI	zki (ci)				
RE-INSPI	ECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO	D:				
AIRS ID#: 0330280 DATE: <u>5/5/09</u>)	ARRIVE: 8:33 AM	DEPART: <u>9:21 A</u>	<u>M</u>			
FACILITY NAME: A-PERFECT N	MIX						
FACILITY LOCATION: 200	00 BORDER ST						
PEI	NSACOLA 32505-480)4					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRES	SENTATIVE: WILLI	AM POWELL PHON	E: (850)554-9691				
CONTACT NAME: Chad Rowe/	Mike Fuchs	PHON	E: (850)554-9691				
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2/7/2 (effecti	2009 / 2/7/2014 ve date) (end date)						
,	, , ,						
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLI</u>	ANCE STATUS (chec	k ☑ only one box)					
	MINOR Non-COMPLI	ANCE SIGNIFICA	NT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))							
<u>Stack Emissions</u>1. Were visible emissions tests of	conducted during this si	e visit according to EPA M	ethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter				
62-297, F.A.C.)?				□Yes ⊠ No			
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity? Yes No							
controlled to the extent neces	3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,						
3. During visible emissions tests	s of the silo dust collecte	ssions to 5 percent opacity? or exhaust points was the lo	ading of the silo conducted	d			
3. During visible emissions tests	s of the silo dust collecte of the normal silo loadi	ssions to 5 percent opacity? or exhaust points was the long rate, or at least at the mi	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour ra	d nte,			
3. During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative	s of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading the in practice?	or exhaust points was the lost rate, or at least at the mi	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour ra	d nte,			
3. During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative unless such rate is unachieval4. Are emissions from the weight to this question is "Yes", ther skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue	s of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading the in practice?	or exhaust points was the long rate, or at least at the minution controlled by the silo on the silo of	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour radiust collector? (If answer is "No" then	d ute, ⊠Yes □ No □Yes □ No			
3. During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative unless such rate is unachieval4. Are emissions from the weight to this question is "Yes", ther	s of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading the in practice?	or exhaust points was the loong rate, or at least at the mition controlled by the siloons 4.a) and 4.b) below. If are evisible emissions test?	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour radiust collector? (If answer is "No" then	d ute, ⊠Yes □ No □Yes □ No			
 During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative unless such rate is unachieval Are emissions from the weight to this question is "Yes", ther skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continua) Was the batching operation b) During the visible emission duration?	of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading ble in practice?	ssions to 5 percent opacity? or exhaust points was the loang rate, or at least at the minution controlled by the silo on the same at the minute of the same at the minute of the same wisible emissions test?	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour radiust collector? (If answer aswer is "No" then	d ite, Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No			
 3. During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative unless such rate is unachieval 4. Are emissions from the weight to this question is "Yes", ther skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continua) Was the batching operation b) During the visible emission duration? 5. If emissions from the weight from the silo dust collector, a 	s of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading the in practice?	e visible emissions test? g rate representative of the side of tests of the weigh hopper (left)	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour radiust collector? (If answer aswer is "No" then anormal batching rate and collector, which is separate patcher) dust collector	d tte, Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No			
 3. During visible emissions tests at a rate that is representative unless such rate is unachieval 4. Are emissions from the weight to this question is "Yes", ther skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continua) Was the batching operation b) During the visible emission duration? 5. If emissions from the weight 	s of the silo dust collected of the normal silo loading the in practice?	e visible emissions test? g rate representative of the side of tests of the weigh hopper (left)	ading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour radiust collector? (If answer aswer is "No" then anormal batching rate and collector, which is separate patcher) dust collector	d tte, Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No			

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C (continued)
(check \square 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.) \bigsymbol{\text{\subsymbol{Z}}Yes} \bigsymbol{\text{\subsymbol{Z}}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?
b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?
submittal date? LYes No
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
The Front Foundation form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date.
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? \Begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc
DADE HA ODED ATTIVO DE CODE VERNICO DE CAMBRILLO DE CAMBR
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))
1. In this facilities, 1) a station and Mr. 2) a mala antable D, and does it haves 2) hother station and mala antable D
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? (<i>Please check ⊠only one box.</i>)
concrete batching and/or nonmetanic numeral processing plants? (Flease check Bronty 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? Yes No
b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel oil usage of all plants less than 240,000 gallons per
calendar year?
c) Is the quantity of material processed less than ten million tons per calendar year? Yes No
d) Is the fuel oil sulfur content 0.5% by weight or less?
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for:
a) fuel consumption on a monthly basis?
b) material processed on a monthly basis?
c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)?Yes \Bigcup No
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)
(check \square appropriate box(es))
(eneck is appropriate box(es))
<u>Unconfined Emissions</u> – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)
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 of the following:
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?
application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
emissions?
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? Yes No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of
particulate matter from stock piles? No
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? \Big Yes \Big No

PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDUR</u> A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>	ES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.			
1. Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form? d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?				
Jennifer Waltrip	5/5/09			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_		
Jennific Waltrip	May 2010	_		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			

COMMENTS: Department personnel conducted an unannounced air program compliance inspection on May 5, 2009 at the A-Perfect Mix facility located in Escambia County. Mr. Chad Rowe and Mr. Mike Fuchs were present to assist during the inspection.

The new premixed concrete batch plant has been constructed, but finishing touches were being completed at the time of the inspection. The new batch plant has a cement silo and a flyash silo, each equipped with a baghouse, and fully enclosed screw conveyors and chutes that will deliver cement and flyash to a fully enclosed batcher. Emissions created by the batcher will be controlled by a baghouse. Site representatives stated a spraybar will be installed to control emissions while loading the truck.

Site representatives stated the original cement storage silo had been sold and will be removed from the property. At the time of the inpsection, the most recent annual visible emissions (VE) test was conducted by Pensacola P.O.C., Inc., on March 21, 2008. No emissions were observed during the 30-minute test. A current VE test has been scheduled for May 27, 2009.

Site representatives stated there were plans to purchase calcium chloride to use as a chemical dust suppressant on the unpaved site.

An earthen berm has been constructed on the perimeter. In order to prevent unconfined emissions from the earthen berm, the Department recommends seeding the berms with grass or other vegetation for stabilization.

Aggregate is stored in three-sided concrete wind breaks to prevent wind blown emissions. However, department personnel noted the stock piles were higher than the height of the concrete windbreaks. In order to prevent fugitive emissions, windbreak wall heights should be increased or stock piles heights should be reduced so as to not exceed the height of the windbreaks.

Records of the amount of materials processed on a monthly basis were requested by Department personnel following the inspection. Those records have not yet been made available to the Department.

Department personnel were notified of a possible name change or change of ownership.

Please note that Rule 62-210.310(2)(b)2, F.A.C., states an owner or operator shall re-register the facility if a change of ownership of all or part of the facility occurs.

Also, Rule 62-210.310(2)(e), F.A.C., states that within 30 days of any minor changes requiring corrections to information contained in the registration form, the owner or operator shall notify the Department in writing. Such changes shall include: (1) Any change in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or (2) Any other similar minor administrative change at the facility.