Concrete Batch Plant Standard Permit
Outreach Group Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2012, 10:00 am, TCEQ, Austin, Building B, Room 201A

I. Introductions

Agency staff introduced themselves to those attending. Becky Southard, Mike Gould, P.E., and Don Nelon of the air permits division and Chrissie Angeletti of legal/environmental law were present.

II. Why we're amending the standard permit

Becky Southard explained that the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) is proposing the amendments to account for the United States Environmental Protection Agency's 2006 AP-42 emission factors and engine requirements.

III. The standard permit amendment process

Becky Southard explained that staff have drafted amendments to the standard permit and it will be available online by September 1, 2012. The public meeting will be on October 3, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. at TCEQ, Building E, Room 201E, 12100 Park 35 Circle in Austin. The official comment period will close on October 5, 2012. Becky Southard is scheduled to present the permit amendments for consideration at the Commissioner's Agenda on December 5, 2012 and the *Texas Register* will publish the official version of the amended permit on December 21, 2012, if approved at Agenda. A stakeholder asked if applying now would extend the amount of time that he could operate under the current standard permit before the amendments are effective. He specifically asked when he would have to comply with the amendments. Becky Southard said that if the amendments are adopted at the December 5, 2012 Agenda, they will be effective on December 21, 2012.

IV. Discussion Points

a. Definitions

Becky Southard read the proposed definitions for concrete batch plant, temporary concrete batch plant, specialty concrete batch plant, and permanent concrete batch plant. A stakeholder noted that a separate definition for concrete batch plant might confuse owners or operators about which category would fit their operation. He suggested putting the parts of the general definition into each of the other terms. Another stakeholder asked staff to clarify that temporary concrete batch plants are not limited to Texas Department of Transportation (TxDot) projects. Staff stated that other projects could also be temporary. A stakeholder expressed concern over the public perception of a facility that TCEQ labels permanent. He said that members of the public might think the operation would be onsite for more than ten years when it may only be there for three. Another stakeholder asked if the concrete batch plant standard permit could be use to authorize pug mills if they could not meet the distance requirement in the permit by rule (PBR).

Mike Gould, P.E. answered that TCEQ will not permit pug mills using the concrete batch plant standard permit.

b. Requirements

1. Becky Southard asked if a 99.5 percent control efficiency was typical for filters used at concrete batch plants. Stakeholders agreed that it was typical, but there was some discussion about manufacturer guarantees and which emissions the filters control. One stakeholder mentioned that at some point the efficiency of the filter could obstruct airflow.
2. Becky Southard asked if the stakeholders could recommend any other dust control methods besides wetting roads, using filters, 3-sided curtains, or walled stockpiles. Stakeholders stated that the permit should not exclude drive-through plants that use a boot or a diaper instead of a 3-sided curtain.
3. Becky Southard asked if any of the concrete additives typically contain volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Stakeholders cautioned against excluding additives with small amounts of VOCs because in the future, the concrete industry may use additives to encapsulate waste that contains VOCs. Stakeholders further suggested that staff should allow a small amount of VOC in additives within the standard permit.
4. Becky Southard mentioned that the 100 feet distance requirement from the baghouse exhaust to the property line would remain unchanged. She asked if this distance was problematic in industry. Stakeholders stated that the 100-foot distance requirement was generally not a problem.
5. Becky Southard stated that the amended standard permit would include currently required recordkeeping.

c. Production

Mike Gould, P.E. explained the proposed production limit in the amended standard permit. Stakeholders expressed concerns that even at an average-sized site; one big project could make the site not applicable to the standard permit. The stakeholders suggested that sites with a larger distance from the nearest receptor or without engines onsite could have a higher production limit. Stakeholders expressed general concern about being limited to 12 hours of production in one day. One stakeholder suggested the possibility of changing the limit to 2400 yards over 24 hours. Another requested that the permit be clear about how owners or operators should calculate production hours.

d. Engines

1. Becky Southard asked the stakeholders if most concrete batch plant facilities had diesel engines on site. Stakeholders responded that many facilities did not have engines, but those that used engines were typically diesel.

2. Becky Southard mentioned a cumulative 1000 horsepower limit in the amended standard permit. Stakeholders responded that the limit would not be a problem.
3. Becky Southard stated that the proposed amendment would require an 8-foot stack on the engine and asked if this matched a typical engine stack at a concrete batch plant. Stakeholders said that many times the stack would be taller than 8 feet from the ground. One stakeholder asked if the stack would need to be vertical. Mike Gould, P.E. said that it would need to be vertical, but that owners or operators could easily add tubing to change a horizontal stack into one that was vertical.

V. Questions for TCEQ

Stakeholders asked staff to clarify when an owner or operator would renew using the amended standard permit. Chrissie Angeletti stated that the courts were still discussing this issue.

A stakeholder requested that the draft be posted both in pdf format with each line numbered and in Word so stakeholders could utilize the track changes feature. Becky Southard said that TCEQ could post it in both formats, but would have to ask about numbering the lines in the PDF version.

A stakeholder asked if temporary concrete batch plants could be limited to one mile to the next project instead of using the word contiguous. Mike Gould, P.E. commented that the definition of site might complicate this.

A stakeholder asked if TCEQ would consider pipelines and sewer treatment plants to be public works. Mike Gould, P.E. stated that TxDot had a specific definition of a public works project and that TCEQ would like to remain consistent with that definition.

A stakeholder asked if temporary concrete batch plants could combine the two public notices. Mike Gould, P.E. responded that this would not work because of how legislative staff wrote the statute regarding concrete batch plants going to notice.

A stakeholder suggested that the permit could contain a table for distance requirements similar to the Ag standard permits or the combined heat and power PBR. Megan Hamilton said that we could consider it, but we were not sure how well those tables had worked in the past.

A stakeholder noted that the air permits division may see an increase in the use of the concrete batch plant with enhanced controls permit because it does not have an averaged production limit.

VI. Next Steps in the Standard Permit Amendment Process

Public meeting:	October 3, 2012
Participant formal comments due:	October 5, 2012
Commissioner's agenda:	December 5, 2012

VII. Conclusion

Becky Southard thanked all attendants for coming and encouraged suggestions and comments between today and the end of the comment period on October 5, 2012.