

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District Office 2353 Jenks Avenue Panama City, Florida 32405-4389 Rick Scott Governor

Jennifer Carroll
Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

February 9, 2012

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL hank.belcher@preferredmaterials.com

Mr. Hank Belcher Preferred Materials, Inc. 900 Ashwood Parkway, Suite 700 Panama City, Florida 30338

Dear Mr. Belcher:

On February 1, 2012, Department representatives with the Air Resource Management Program inspected the Preferred Materials Panama City Concrete Batch Plant ID 0050043. 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 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 (<u>mary.beth.curle@dep.state.fl.us</u>)

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

Mr. Kevin Harrington, Preferred Materials (<u>kharrington@preferredmaterials.com</u>)



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)				
AIRS ID#: 0050043 DATE: <u>2/1/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:35</u>	DEPART: <u>10:30</u>				
FACILITY NAME: PREFERRED MATERIALS-	PANAMA CITY					
FACILITY LOCATION: 1901-B E 15TH ST						
CEDAR GROVE	32405					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: HENRY "HANK" BELCHER PHONE: (813)384-3025 Email: Hank.Belcher@preferredmaterials.com Mobile: (352)279-0404 CONTACT NAME: Kevin Harrington PHONE: (850)872-3511 Email: kharrington@preferredmaterials.com Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/15/2007 / 12/15/2012 (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 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Kevin Harr	_	(check ☑ only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes: I met with Kevin Harrington and w	as given access to all areas of this faci	lity and all recquired records.				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still HENRY "H If no, who is?: NA	IANK" BELCHER?					
If different, did the facility provide an administrat 3. Is the facility contact still Kevin Harrington? If no, who is?: NA						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at le						

Emissions Unit Section 4 - CENTRAL DUST COLLECTION SYSTEM subject to Reasonable Precautions

4 -CENTRAL DUST COLLECTION SYSTEM subject to Reasonable Precautions						
P	PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION					
	Date of last inspection: 1/14/2011 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No				
<u>P</u> .	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.					
	nconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and onveying 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 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				
	owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	☐ No				
	particulate matter from stock piles? Yes	□ No				
2	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)?	□ No				
	b. If tested: (NA)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	☐ No				

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? NA

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		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 ∑ 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 gener 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?	-	 No No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	ne/yr)?
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?	iption - Nes	□ No
	Note: Permit Eligibility Part 3. (a)(b)(c)(d)(e) and Part 4 are not applicable for this facility at this		
GI	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?		⊠ 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 terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	 No 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?		☐ 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? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following</i>)	_
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(6)] 	6)]
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? 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? -	5)]
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per 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 If YES, what was the purpose?	e)? Yes No
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
Note: Relocatable Plant Part 2. (a)(b)(c) and Part 3. (a)(b) are not applicable for this facility at the second se	his time.
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Administrative Changes:	•
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	nits or
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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?d. A change in ownership?	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. − d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change? ⊠ N.	
C. Mark Sumner 2/1/2012	
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection	
Mark Ser February 2013	
1 columny 2013	

COMMENTS: Department peronnel conducted an air program compliance inspection on February 1, 2012.

The annual VE test was performed 3/15/2011 by Arlington Environmental Services for central dust collector that covers the batcher (weigh hopper) and the Cement and Fly ash silos.

Records of the air permit, VE tests, amount of material used, and weekly plant maintenance/inspection check list are maintained and avaliable for review.

The facility does not need to maintain records on fuel sulfur content or amounts as plant is powered by off site generated electricity (power grid).

An observation of the site revealed that each silo and the weigh hopper are equipped with a central bag house. The batcher (weigh hopper) is also equiped with curtains. The aggregate piles are managed and kept wet, and the majority of the site has been paved with the dust levels managed with frequent wash downs. At the time on this inspection no dust was observes at the facility.

A review of the facility records revealed that this plant has batched about 24,000 yards of concrete from January to December 2011.