

Florida Department of **Environmental Protection**

2353 Jenks Avenue

Northwest District Office Panama City, Florida 32405-4389 Governor

Rick Scott

Jennifer Carroll Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

June 25, 2012

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 June 13, 2012, a Department representative with the Air Resource Management Program inspected the Griffin Sand and Concrete Co., Inc Marianna Concrete Batch Plant ID 0630064. A copy of the inspection report is enclosed.

An area of non-compliance is identified in the inspection report. Please notify this office within 15 days of receipt of this letter as to what steps you have taken to correct the deficiency listed in the 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 by email at mark.c.sumner@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Wilson III, P.E.

Panama City Branch Administrator

CDW/ms

Enclosure

c: Ms. Mary Beth Curle, FDEP Pensacola (mary.beth.curle@dep.state.fl.us)

Ms. Carol Melton, FDEP Pensacola (carol.melton@dep.state.fl.us)

Mr. Wayne Walden, Griffin Sand & Concrete (<u>waynewalden08@gmail.com</u>)



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA		Y(CI)		
AIRS ID#: 0630064 DATE: 6/13/12 ARRIVE: 1:00 DEPART: 2:30					
FACILITY NAME: MARIANNA PLANT					
FACILITY LOCATION: 3031 AUCTION DR					
MARIANNA 3244	48-7715				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: LISA WALDEN* Email: grifsand@fairpoint.net CONTACT NAME: ROBERT WALDEN Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2/3/2012 / 2/3/2017 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (850)674-8664 Mobile: (850)643-6162 PHONE: (850)482-2626 Mobile: (850)573-2017					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING				(1 1 7	
Name(s) of facility representative(s): WAYNE WAYN				(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Brief Notes: I met with Mr. Walden and inspected the facility and discussed the need for a current VE test.					
Is the Authorized Representative still LISA WALD If no, who is?: NA	DEN*?			⊠ Yes	□No
If different, did the facility provide an administrativ 3. Is the facility contact still ROBERT WALDEN? If no, who is?: NA				☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today. If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least				Yes Yes	⊠No □No

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

<u>1 – CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions</u>				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION				
1. Date of last inspection: 7/14/2011 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No			
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.				
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>				
 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? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	□ No			
control emissions?	☐ No			
particulate matter?	☐ 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: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? N/A Yes b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A Yes c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ No ☐ No			

Emissions Unit Section

2 - CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

	2 - CCD Traint-sho (hyash) w/shotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Trecautions	<u> </u>		
PA	PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
	Date of last inspection: 7/14/2011 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	⊻ Yes □ Yes □ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
PA	ART 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				
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 foll 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 		☐ No	
	control emissions?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	
	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?	⊠ 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: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No	

Emissions Unit Section

3 -CCB Plant-cement/flyash batcher hopper w/vent filter subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION				
	Date of last inspection: 7/14/2011 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No		
PA	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.				
Co	Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards				
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 f 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 		☐ No		
	control emissions?	- X Yes	☐ No		
		- X Yes	☐ No		
		⊠ 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: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? N/A b. If tested: (NA)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? NA	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check		only one uestion)
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?	X Ye	S	□ 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		s	⊠ 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?		S	⊠ 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?	☐ Ye ☐ Ye ☐ Ye ☐ Ye ☐ Ye	s s s	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	$\frac{0 \text{ gal diesel/yr} + 0 \text{ gal gasoline/yr} + 0 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{0 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{0 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} \leq 1.00?$	•		
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? N/A	iption Ye	s	☐ 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?		S	⊠ 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	· 🛚 Ye	s	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		s	☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general		c	□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(che	ck 🗹 only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	box for	r each question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		on 2.)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and	_	_
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	\ \ \ \	es 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 e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day 		Yes ☐ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif		icsivo
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busi	ness days following a relocation? Y	es No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific		
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ve 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 un		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	irpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? [Y	Yes
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? -	\(\sqrt{\sq}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}	Yes No
Note: Relocatable Plant Part 2. (a)(b)(c) and Part 3. (a)(b)(c) a	are not applicable for this facility at this ti	me.
<u>CHANGES</u>		ck 🗹 only one
Administrative Changes:	box for	r each question)
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of	f the facility or authorized representative not	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation		
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adn		Yes ⊠ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	s of the change? N/A Y	Yes No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		
a. Installation of any new process equipment?		es 🗵 No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement		Yes ⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	stantially different? Y	Yes 🛛 No Yes 🖾 No
u. A change in ownership:	<u> </u>	.03 🔼 110
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrate		
30 days prior to the change?	× N/A \ Y	Yes No
C. Mark Sumner	June 13, 2012	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_
\mathcal{M} / \sim		
Mark Sen		
	June 2013	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: The permit for this facility was issued on February 3, 2012, and the initial EPA Method 9 visual Emission test for this facility was due by March 4, 2012. The weigh hopper/batcher emissions are controlled by a spray bar and a partial enclosure at this facility. No trucks were loaded during this inspection and it is unknown whether the spray bar adequately controls dust emissions at this time. The facility has installed a partial enclosure around the batching area, and the enclosure appears to be well maintained and in good condition. 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. Note: The EPA Method 9 visual Emission test for this facility is past due. Please ensure the plant is tested as soon as possible.