

## METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY .

Action A

Jet Fra. Losse

Str. B. Con Cont.

Fr. B. Con Cont.

REMARKS:

Cony

BSK-RED

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

909 S.E. First Avenus Brickell Plaza, Building - Rm. 402 Miami, Florida 33131

Talephone: 579-2760

May 13, 1980

707 11 1883

Warren G. Strahm, P.E.
Subdistrict Manager
Department of Environmental Regulation
P.O. Box 3858
West Palm Beach, Florida 33402

Reference: Application for Permits to Modify Three (3) Cement Kilns

and Construct Coal Handling and Grinding Facility

Applicant: Lonestar Florida Pennsuco, Inc.

Location: 11000 N.W. 121 Street, Hialeah, Florida

Dear Mr. Strahm:

The referenced application has been reviewed with regards to the requirements of Chapters 17-2 and 17-4 of the Rules of the State of Florida Department of Environmental Regulation and Chapter 24, Dade County Pollution Control Ordinance. We offer no objections to the issuance of a construction permit for the aforementioned facility provided that the following comments are addressed satisfactorily or included as permit provisos:

1. Due to the increase in sulfur emissions associated with the proposed modification, the impact on Dade County's ambient SO2 standards has to be addressed. According to an April, 1980 pollutant dispersion modeling study prepared by Environmental Science & Engineering, Inc., the maximum predicted SO2 concentrations associated with kilns #1,2,& 3 fuel conversion are below Dade County ambient standards. However, the maximum four-hour interaction concentration with Alton Box Board Co., a manufacturing facility located approximately 7.5 kilometers southeast of the applicant, is projected to be 82.72 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, exceeding the Chapter 24 standard of 57.2 ug/m3. Since Alton Box Board is depicted to exceed the four-hour standard individually and Lonestar's emissions are apparently insignificant ( \$5ug/m3) at the interaction receptor location, it is felt the applicant's proposed modification should not be denied on the basis of sulfur dioxide emissions. It is recommended that Alton Box Board demonstrate a SO2 emissions reduction prior to the renewal of its permit.

MAY 22 1980

·	ACTION NO.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP	ACTION DUE	ACTION DUE DATE	
1. TO: (NAME, OFFICE, LOCATION)	. <u></u>	MITIAL	
C. Holladay-BARM TAL	I AHASS	DATE	
i.		INITIAL	
		DATE	
1.		INITIAL	
DER		DATE	
	<del></del> -	INITIAL	
OST 11 1933		DAIS	
	<del></del>		
FUI as repuested!	RIFORM		
fy is as requestred?		EW & RETURN EW & FILE	
I'm not too sure if this	<b>├</b> ─┼──-	AL & FORWARD	
will help as it refers only		<del></del>	
	DISPOSI	HON	
to the previously approved SOZ	ervu	W & BESPOND	
emission limita (BACT). As disus	ack	PE RESPONSE	
w/ larry hearge, we should consider	1100	MY SIGHATURE	
FACEule 17-2.500(d) which implies	} <del>-</del> }	DISCUSS	
modeling on by Changle of Lothertan emissiona	┟╌╉╼╌╾	P MEETING	
since baseline date) to determine wer of	MVE	TIGATE & REPT	
Significant impact. (2). The existing	941714	L & FORWARD	
violation would still have to be	DISTR	<b>S</b> UTE	
abdressed by anyone whose facilities	<del></del>	URRENCE	
significantly imposed a violation	<b>├</b> ─ <b>┼</b> ──	ROCESSING	
		<del> </del>	
(Alton Box, Lonentar & (others?)) This may be (make previously proposed rule) a conflict in the rule purhaveby we would be	.		
allowing an insignificant increase at a "know wint of violation" but requireding the same	1		
facility to decreese the same pollutorate of the facility through enforcements			
om:  Tout table por	DATE	17/83	
Deep Deep	<b></b>	1,100	

•

٠.