

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANTS

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



| Configuration |
|---|
| INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) |
| RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO |
| AIRS ID#: 1050064 DATE: 1-29-09 ARRIVE: 10:30 DEPART: 11:00 |
| FACILITY NAME: FLORIDA ROCK - BARTOW |
| FACILITY LOCATION: 495 W Main St. |
| Bartow, 33830 |
| OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:PHONE: |
| CONTACT NAME: Katherine Chumley - (804) 380- 1030 PHONE: DAWNY KELL (941) 533-4191 |
| ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: //-3-/0 ///-3-05 (From) |
| (To) (From) |
| |
| 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)) |
| (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) |
| (check ✓ appropriate box(es)) Stack Emissions |
| (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.)? 1. Yes ☑ No |
| (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.)?——————————————————————————————————— |
| (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.)? |
| (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.)? 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? 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, |
| (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.)? 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? 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, |
| (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.)? 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? 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? 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer |
| Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 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? 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? 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 |
| Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 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? 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? 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.) |
| Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 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? 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? 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 No Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? Yes No |
| Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? |
| Stack Emissions |
| Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? |

| 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 annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.) | the Yes | No | |
| | | | |
| New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.310(5), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 2. Did this facility demonstrate initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation? | Y es | □ No | |
| Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.310(5), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted within 365 decreases. | a∀s | | |
| (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions compliance test? | 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 test was completed? | r the | | |
| | | | |
| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-210,310(5)(b), F.A.C. | <u> </u> | | |
| (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) | | | |
| 1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary (2) a relocatable (3); or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check only one box.) | le | | |
| 2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concreted batching plants | | | |
| or nonmetallic mineral processing plants: | | A.K. | |
| a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: | | | |
| 1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel | Yes | ☐ No | |
| 2) 23,000 gallons of gasoline | Yes | ☐ No | |
| 3) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas | | | |
| 4) 1.3 million gallons of propane | | | |
| 5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite | Yes | ☐ No | |
| 3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant submitting this registration maintain a log book or | | | |
| books to account for fuel consumption on a monthly basis? | - Yes | ☐ No | |
| Relocation Notification - (Rule 61-210.310(5)(b)3.b., F.A.C.) 1. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or | | | |
| stabilization?—(if your answer is YES, please proceed to 1. a) thru 1.b) below) | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | |
| a) Did the owner or operator notify the Department by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication | 1 | | |
| at least one (1) business day prior to changing location? ? | Yes | ☐ No | |
| b) Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form (DEP No. 62-210.900(6) | | | |
| to the Department no later than five (5) business days following a relocation? | Yes | □ No | |
| If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below 2. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form (DEP No. 62-210.900(6)) at | | | |
| least five (5) business days prior to relocation? | 🔲 Yes | ₩ No | |

| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued) (check ✓ appropriate box(es)) |
|---|
| <u>Unconfined Emissions</u> – (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? |
| 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? |
| 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 62-210.310(2), F.A.C. |
| A. New or Modified Process Equipment |
| 1. Since the last inspection has there been |
| a) installation of any new process equipment?———————————————————————————————————— |
| b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? |
| c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form? |
| 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 \(\sigma\)No |
| |
| |
| COMMENTS: LAST / FLYASH AND Z CEMENT SILOS CONTROLLED BY I CENTRAL BACHOUSE. DETAIN COPY OF Y-ZI-OB TEST. ONLY BMISSION POINT IS ON BACHOUSE. |
| I WAS ORIGINALLY GOING TO OBSERVE THE WE TEST SCHED. FOR 11:00 BUT THE FACILITY |
| HAN TO DELAY THE TEST YNTIL DOOD. KEVETT MICKLE WAR GROVE SCI. ARRIVED ON SITE |
| PRIOR TO 11:00 AND WILL PERFORM THE VE TEST. I HAD TO LEAVE TO CONDYCT ANOTHER |
| INSPECTION. THE PLANT WAS NOT OPERATING DURING MY VISIT. NO FUGITIVE EMISSION |
| WERE OBSERVED. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Max Grondah 1-29-39 Inspector's Name Date of Inspection |
| |
| Inspector's Signature j-29-12 Approximate Date of Next Inspection |