



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

March 5, 2012

By Electronic Mail, Received Receipt Requested
ssimonsen@argos-us.com

Mr. Stephen Simonsen
Regional Environmental Director
ARGOS Ready Mix, LLC
12735 Morris Road Extension
Suite 300
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

Dear Mr. Simonsen:

On February 28, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected your facility, ID 0330070. 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 Chris Stoll at 850/595-0654 or e-mail christopher.stoll@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "Carol Melton".

Carol Melton
Air Compliance Supervisor

CM/cs/c

Enclosure
c: Danny Byrd, ARGOS: dbyrd@argos-us.com



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
 RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 0330070	DATE: <u>2/28/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>3:25 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>3:56 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: ARGOS READY MIX LLC-PENSACOLA CCB PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 100 E OLIVE RD PENSACOLA 32514-4529			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: STEVE SIMONSEN		PHONE: (678)746-2184	
Email: ssimonsen@argos-us.com		Mobile: (770)356-7285	
CONTACT NAME: ANDY WORKMAN		PHONE: (850)235-9600	
Email: aworkman@argos-us.com		Mobile:	
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/4/2011 / 12/4/2016 (effective date) (end date)			

Facility Section

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box)

IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING (check only one box for each question)

1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Danny Byrd
 Brief Notes: _____

2. Is the Authorized Representative still STEVE SIMONSEN? ----- Yes ..No
 If no, who is?: _____
 If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? ----- Yes ..No

3. Is the facility contact still ANDY WORKMAN? ----- Yes ..No
 If no, who is?: _____

4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? ----- Yes ..No
 If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? ----- Yes ..No

Emissions Unit Section

5-CCB Plant-silos(2cement/1flyash),batcherw/cent.dustcollector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check [X] only one box for each question)

- 1. Date of last inspection: 5/4/2011
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? [X] Yes [] No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? [] Yes [X] No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? [X] N/A [] Yes [] No
d. Date of last VE test: 7/14/2011
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? [X] Yes [] No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? [X] Yes [] No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 26.6 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 [X] Yes [] No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? [X] Yes [] No
j. What was the actual batching rate? 6yds tons/hour
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-- [X] Yes [] No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment

(check [X] only one box for each question)

- 1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit? [] Yes [X] No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? [] Yes [] 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
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 conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? [] Yes [] No [] N/A - silo not loaded during inspection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? [] Yes [] 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 to h.
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? [] Yes [] No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [] Yes [] No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [] Yes [] No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? [] Yes [X] No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? [] Yes [] 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)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

(check only one box for each 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? ----- Yes No
 - b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ----- Yes No
 - c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? ----- Yes No

2. Does this facility include:
 - a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? ----- Yes No
 If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? _____

 - 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
 If YES, what other general permit units or activities? _____

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 No
 - b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? ----- Yes No
 - c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? ----- Yes No
 - d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? ----- Yes No
 - e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? ----- Yes No
$$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{gal gasoline/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$$

4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? ----- Yes No

GENERAL CONDITIONS

(check only one box for each 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? ----- Yes No
 - 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
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access 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:

(check only one box for each question)

- 1. Is the facility: stationary ; relocatable ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? *(If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)*
- 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ----- Yes No
(If YES, answer 2. a and 2. b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)
 - 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 Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? ---- Yes No
 - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? --- Yes No
- 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, 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

CHANGES

(check only one box for each question)

Administrative Changes:

- 1. Were there any changes 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 any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? ---- Yes No
- 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? ----- Yes 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? ----- Yes No
 - c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? ----- Yes No
 - d. A change in ownership? ----- Yes No
- 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? ----- Yes No

Chris Stoll

2/28/2012

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

2/2013

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: An unannounced compliance inspection was conducted on February 28, 2012, at the ARGOS concrete batching plant located on Olive Road in Escambia County. The emissions units located at the facility include three silos and one loading spout. All emissions from these units are controlled using one dust collector. The last visible emissions (VE) test was conducted on June 14, 2011. During the 30-minute VE test, zero emissions were observed from the dust collector. The facility appeared to be well maintained. Maintenance records indicate fugitive emissions are controlled by washing particulate matter from the paved portions of the facility using recycled water. Unconfined emissions are controlled from stock piles by maintaining the height of the stock piles below the block walls and using a water sprinkler system on some of the stock piles.