



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
 RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 1310018 **DATE:** 6/12/09 **ARRIVE:** 12:31 PM **DEPART:** 12:42 PM
FACILITY NAME: FORT WALTON CONCRETE - DEFUNIAK SPRINGS
FACILITY LOCATION: HWY 90 & NORWOOD RD
 DE FUNIAK SPRINGS
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: BARBARA WOOLLARD **PHONE:** (850)243-8114
CONTACT NAME: **PHONE:**
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/5/2005 / 6/5/2010
 (effective date) (end date)

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box)
 IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.
 (check appropriate box(es))

Stack Emissions

1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?----- Yes No
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?----- Yes No
3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate, unless such rate is unachievable in practice?----- Yes No
4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer to this question is “Yes”, then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is “No” then skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)----- Yes No
 - a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?----- Yes No
 - b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?----- Yes No
5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?----- Yes No

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued)

(check appropriate box(es))

Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)

1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)----- Yes No

New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)

2. Did this facility demonstrate:
- a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?----- Yes No
- b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?----- Yes No

Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)

3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?----- Yes No

Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.)

4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed?----- Yes No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.

(check appropriate box(es))

1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary ; 2) a relocatable ; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (*Please check only one box.*)
2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (*If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d,) below.*)----- Yes No
- a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?----- Yes No
- b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel oil usage of all plants less than 240,000 gallons per calendar year?----- Yes No
- c) Is the quantity of material processed less than ten million tons per calendar year?----- Yes No
- d) Is the fuel oil sulfur content 0.5% by weight or less?----- Yes No
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for:
- a) fuel consumption on a monthly basis?----- Yes No
- b) material processed on a monthly basis?----- Yes No
- c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)?----- Yes No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)

(check appropriate box(es))

Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)

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?----- Yes No
- 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?----- Yes No
- 3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the 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

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.

A. New or Modified Process Equipment

1. Since the last inspection has there been
- a) installation of any new process equipment?----- Yes No
 - b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?----- Yes No
 - c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?----- Yes No
 - d) If you answered **YES** to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?----- Yes No

Jennifer Waltrip

June 12, 2009

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection



Inspector's Signature

June 2010

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: A Department representative conducted an unannounced annual air program compliance inspection on June 12, 2009 at the Fort Walton Concrete batch plant located in Defuniak Springs in Walton County.

The Facility was not in operation during the inspection and no one was present, thus an onsite review of records was not performed.

The plant has two storage silos, one each for flyash and cement. The silos are each equipped with a baghouse to control emissions and a spray bar is used to control emissions while loading the trucks.

During the inspection, sand and aggregate were observed to be stock piled, with no wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter. The road into the facility and the yard consist of dirt which can be a source of excess emissions. Please note that Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C., requires reasonable precautions to be taken to control unconfined emission from truck loading and unloading areas, roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards.

The annual 2009 visible emissions ("VE") test was initially conducted on March 18, 2009. The cement storage silo experienced a bag failure during the 28th minute. Loading was halted and the test was stopped to make repairs to the baghouse. The cement silo was retested on May 15, 2009 and no emissions were observed during the 30-minute test. Emissions were noted during the 10th minute for the fly ash storage silo due to a blown pop-off valve. The silo will be retested when the next load is delivered. Please remember to schedule the VE test prior to December 31, 2009.

The results of the initial VE tests ,conducted on March 18, 2009, were due to be received by the Department within 45 days of testing as required by Rule 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C. Results should have been received by May 2, 2009, but were not received until June 3, 2009. Also, the Department did not receive a 15 day notice, as required by Rule 62-297.310(7)(a)9, F.A.C., prior to the May 15, 2009 cement storage silo re-test . Please ensure the Department receives proper notification prior to the re-test for the fly ash silo.

The Entitlement Period (authority to operate the facility) expires on June 5, 2010. Please note that Rule 62-210.310(2)(c)2, F.A.C., requires the submittal of the proper registration form and processing fee at least 30 days prior to expiration of the facility's existing air general permit in order to avoid lapse of authority to operate.