

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Northwest District Branch Office 3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS 55 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000 Rick Scott Governor

Jennifer Carroll Lt. Governor

Herschel T. Vinyard Jr. Secretary

September 19, 2011

SENT VIA E-MAIL suecu@readymixusa.com

Sue Cummings Environmental Coordinator Couch Ready Mix USA 2570 Ruffner Road Birmingham, Alabama 35210

Dear Ms. Cummings:

A Department representative inspected your facilities to determine compliance with the Air Quality Operating Permits. The program identification number for this facility is **0730059**. The permit expires on **March 6**, **2015**. This letter applies only to activities covered by the Air Resource Management Program.

The Tallahassee Branch Office reported a status of In Compliance for your facility. The inspection checklist is enclosed. Your facility compliance status may be subject to further review by the District Program Office.

The assistance you provided is appreciated. If you have any questions, your local contact is Tracy White at 850/245-2960 or tracy.a.white@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Marlane Castellanos

Marlane Castellano

Branch Manager

MC/tw Enclosures

cc: Rick Bradburn, FDEP, Pensacola

Mary Beth Curle, FDEP Carol Melton, FDEP



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	RE-INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	_	T/DISCOVERY (CI) PLAINT NO:			
ΑI	IRS ID#: 0730059 DATE: <u>8/29/2011</u>	ARRIVE:	DEI	PART:		
FA	ACILITY NAME: WEEMS RD READY MIX PLA	ANT				
FA	ACILITY LOCATION: 3440 WEEMS RD					
	TALLAHASSEE 32	2317-7506				
CO	WNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: El Email: ErinC@readymixusa.com ONTACT NAME: MAISON SCOZARRI Email: NTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/6/2010 / 3/6/2015 (effective date) (end date)	5	PHONE: (229)9	986-4800 936-3572 924-5717 740-0254		
Facility Section						
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ✓ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
- ·						
	Name(s) of facility representative(s): Robert Heurin Brief Notes: Plant Operator	<u>ng</u>		(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still ERIN CHRIST If no, who is?: Sue Cummings	TIE?		Yes \(\int_{\text{No}}\))	
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative Is the facility contact still MAISON SCOZARRI? If no, who is?:					
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least					

Emissions Unit Section

1 - CCB Plant-cement/flyashsilosw/silotopDC's/loadoutw/centr.DC subject to 5% Opacity Limit PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION (check **☑** only one box for each question) 1. Date of last inspection: 8/06/2011 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? ------No b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? ----- X Yes No c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ----- N/A Yes Yes ☐ No d. Date of last VE test: <u>7/12/2011</u> e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? ----- Yes f Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?

	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 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 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	No No No
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	
			1 /
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	☐ Yes	⊠ 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 co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load		_
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	⊥ Yes	∐ No
	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	_	Пх
	 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra 	☐ Yes te and	∐ No
	duration?	- Yes	☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	•	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?	Yes Yes	☐ No
2	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.	_	⊠ Na
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	☐ Yes☐ Yes	⊠ No □ 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)

~	ANTIDIA A STONE OF CONTROLLY DEPLATE ELICIDIA 1997		
<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 multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
1	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal proparation of monthly fuel consumments. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumments.	e/yr	?
4.	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		⊠ 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? 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 ☑ only one		
Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square box for each question) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i>)		
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement 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 Departme e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one businesb. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation N	s day prior to changing location? Yes No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Note to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least	otification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a sepa	arate air construction or air operation permit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emission a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routin If YES, what was the purpose?		
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how le co-located at the permitted facility?		
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration	on?	
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone numb associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relo operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor	cation of the facility or any emissions units or administrative change at the facility? Yes No	
 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?		
a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacer c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership?	ment?	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new regi 30 days prior to the change?	stration form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes No	
Tracy White	8/29/2011	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
I may to here		
I ray Ev hue	Date of hispection	

COMMENTS: I met with Robert Heuring. Batch trucks were present, but Mr. Heuring did not know when the next batch would be processed. No changes to equipment were noted. Two silos with two filter units were present. A baghouse was used for the batcher operations. Potential for unconfined emissions was noted from the accumulation of yard dust. The yard may need more application of reasonable precautions for the accumulated material, etc.