

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District 160 Governmental Center, Suite 308 Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794 Charlie Crist Governor

Jeff Kottkamp Lt. Governor

Mimi A. Drew Secretary

November 29, 2010

By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested spc2@bellsouth.net

Mr. E. K. "Skip" Edwards, President Southern Prestressed Concrete, Inc. Post Office Box 2338 Pensacola, Florida 32513-0338

Dear Mr. Edwards:

On November 19, 2010, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 0330055. 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.

However, it was noted that the person on file as the authorized representative for the site no longer works for Southern Prestressed Concrete, Inc., and the facility has plans to close by the end of the year. Please carefully review the comments section of the enclosed inspection report to ensure proper notification is submitted to the Department.

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,

Rick Bradburn

Air Program Administrator

Rich Bradlow

RB/jw/c

Enclosure



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	(INS1, INS2) CTION (FUI)		AINT/DISC	COVERY (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 0330055 DATE: 11/19/1	<u>0</u>	ARRIVE:	1:44 PM	DEPART:	2:03 PM	
FACILITY NAME: PENSACOLA	PLANT					
FACILITY LOCATION: 128	AIRPORT BLVD					
PEN	SACOLA 32503-7	7626				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESI Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/30/2 (effective	010 / 1/30/2015	HAEL MAJO	Me PH	HONE: (850)476-612 obile: HONE: obile:	0	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTO 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s Brief Notes:		Production Cod	<u>ordinator</u>		(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative st If no, who is?:	ill MICHAEL MAJO	ORS?			☐ Yes	⊠No
If different, did the facility provide 3. Is the facility contact still? If no, who is?:					Yes Yes	□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test If yes, was the compliance authorit					Yes Yes	⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement), w/silotop baghouse, 120T capacity subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: 3/5/10	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	- Nes	⊠ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		□ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	Z 105	
operation? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 2/8/10		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 27.23 tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	_	
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	N 10	□ N
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- 🛚 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	
	0011 101 04011	question
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	- Nes	⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	L Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	□ v	□ N.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	L Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points which is the silo dust collector exhaust points and the silo dust collector exhaust points are silong the silong points and the silong points are silong the silong points and the silong points are silong points are silong points.	onducted at a r	ate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	☐ Yes	☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go t		
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching		□ N
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mir		☐ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	- Yes	⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Tyes	☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Facility Section (continued)

-			
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ 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
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 general 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 problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? d. 1.3 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? d. 1.3 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems of the first plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if problems less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of gasoline? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? d. 1.3 millio	- Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Annology - Yes	☐ No
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?	nption - Yes	☐ No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	
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. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all		□ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	S	□ No
	permit and Department rules?	🛛 Yes	No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	•
1. Is the facility: stationary \(\subseteq \); relocatable \(\subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \(\subseteq \) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the follow</i>)	box for each ing question 2.)	. ,
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	□ No
 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? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900] 		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Research to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation? - to the appropriate Department of Local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the local Air Program no later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of the later them five by Schollowing a relocation of	(6)]	□ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pound 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 of YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was 	ge)? 🗌 Yes	☐ No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen	tative not	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? - 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	ınits or ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ 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?		⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?d. A change in ownership?		⊠ No ⊠ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee su 30 days prior to the change?	ıbmitted	☐ No
Jennifer Waltrip November 19, 2010		
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
November 2011		
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next In		

COMMENTS: Department personnel conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance inspection of Southern Prestressed Concrete in Escambia County. Mr. Larry Lynch was available to assist during the inspection. The facility was not in operation at the time of the inspection and according to Mr. Lynch, the facility will be closed for business by the end of the year. The facility has not been in operation since September 2010.

The current permit for the facility became effective on January 30, 2010 and will expire on January 30, 2015. If the permit remains active, testing is required on an annual basis. However, due to the economic climate, the Department recognizes that many permitted facilities have temporarily shut down one or all of their emissions units. Due to this current situation, the Department is

not requiring facilities to start-up specifically to perform a compliance test by its due date. If your facility and/or emission unit(s) are temporarily shut-down, please submit notification to the Department stating the date the facility and/or emission unit(s) temporarily shut-down. Upon recommencing operation, the Department shall be notified as soon as possible, but no later than five calendar days after start-up. Also, the emission unit(s) shall be tested as soon as practicle, but no later than 30 days after start-up. Notification shall be sent to Department of Environmental Protection, Northwest District Air Program, 160 Governmental Center, Suite 308, Pensacola, Florida 32502-5794.

If the facility will be permanently closed and you would like to surrender the permit, please contact Dickson Dibble at 850/921-9586 or Dickson.Dibble@dep.state.fl.us.

Also, the owner/authorized representative listed for this facility is Mr. Michael Majors, whom we have been informed is no longer employed by Southern Prestressed Concrete, Inc. Please note, Rule 62-210.310(2)(d)1, Florida Administrative Code, states that the owner or operator shall notify the Department in writing within 30 days of any change in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership.

If plans are to keep the permit active, please submit the written notice of change of authorized representative to the following address:

FDEP-DARM Air General Permit Program BAMMS. MS5510 2600 Blair Stone Road Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2400