

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

RICK SCOTT GOVERNOR

CENTRAL DISTRICT 3319 MAGUIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 232 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32803

HERSCHEL T. VINYARD JR. SECRETARY

August 19, 2013

Kathie Chumley, Environmental Services Manager Vulcan Materials Company 3599 SW 74th Ave Ocala, FL 34474 ChumleyK@VMCMAIL.com

Re: Florida Rock Industries/Ocala Plant

Air 0830132 IW FLG110088 Marion County OCD-CAP-13-2849

Dear Ms. Chumley:

Department personnel conducted a compliance inspection of the above-referenced facility on July 29, 2013. Based on the information provided during and following the inspection, the facility was determined to be in compliance with the Department's rules and regulations. A copy of the inspection report is attached for your records.

The Department appreciates your efforts to maintain this facility in compliance with state and federal rules. Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Lauren Staly at 407-897-2957 or via e-mail at Lauren.Staly@dep.state.fl.us.

Sincerely,

Reggie Phillips, Manager

Central District

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Enclosures: Inspection Reports (with attachments)

cc: Matt Carcaba, CarcabaM@VMCMAIL.com

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

WASTEWATER COMPLIANCE INSPECTION REPORT

FACILITY AND INSPECTION INFORMATION @ = Optional Name and Physical Location of Facility WAFR ID: **Entry Date/Time** County Florida Rock Industries - Ocala Concrete Batch Plant FLG110088 Marion 3599 SW 74th Ave. Phone @ Exit Date/Time Ocala, FL 34474 Name(s) of Field Representatives(s) Title Phone Bernie Schomas Authorized Representative Name and Address of Permittee or Designated Representative Title Phone @ Operator Certification # Katherine R. Chumley **Environmental Services** (904)380-0130 Vulcan Materials Company Manager P.O. Box 4667 **Email** Jacksonville, FL 32201 ChumleyK@VMC.com Inspection Type Ε Samples Taken(Y/N): N @ Sample ID#: Samples Split (Y/N): Were Photos Taken(Y/N): Log book Volume: @ Page: **Domestic Industrial** FACILITY COMPLIANCE AREAS EVALUATED IC: In Compliance; MC: Minor Out of Compliance; NC: Out of Compliance SC: Significant Non-Compliance; NA: Not Applicable; NE or Blank: Not Evaluated Significant Non-Compliance Criteria Should be Reviewed When Out of Compliance Ratings Are Given in Areas Marked by a "◆" EFFLUENT/DISPOSAL ELF MONITORING PERMITS/ORDERS FACILITY OPERATIONS IC NA 3. Laboratory 6. Facility Site Review NA 1.♦Permit 9. ♦Effluent Quality NA 2. ♦ Compliance Schedules NA 4. Sampling NA 7. Flow Measurement IC 10. ♦ Effluent Disposal IC 5.♦Records & Reports IC 8. ♦ Operation & Maintenance IC 11. Biosolids/Sludge NA 12. Ground Water NA 14. Other: NA 13. ♦SSO Survey Facility and/or Order Compliance Status: In-Compliance Out-Of-Compliance Significant-Out-Of-Compliance **Recommended Actions: Compliance Letter** Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) District Office/Phone Number Lauren Staly Central District Office 08/14/2013 407-897-2957 District Office/Phone Number Date @ Signature of Reviewer Reggie Phillips 08/14/2013 Central District Office 407-897-4132 Single Event Violation Code(s):

Facility Name: Florida Rock Industries- Ocala

Facility ID No: FLG110088

Inspection Type: CEI

Inspection Date: 07/29/2013

FACILITY BACKGROUND:

Facility Address: 3599 SW 74th Ave., Ocala, FL 34474

Program/ Permit Information: Wastewater Permit issued: 3/23/2009, expires: 3/22/2014

- 1. **Permit:** RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 1.1. Observation: A copy of the permit was onsite and available to plant personnel.
- 2. **Compliance Schedules:** RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 3. **Laboratory:** RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 4. Sampling: RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 5. **Records and Reports:** RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 5.1 <u>Observation:</u> Permit, stormwater management plan and best management practices were available on site for review by the Department.
- 6. Facility Site Review: RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 6.1 Observation: The Type I and II basins appear to have adequate freeboard.
- 7. Flow Measurement: RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 8. Operation and Maintenance: RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 8.1 <u>Observation:</u> The sediment trap on the south side of the property near the retention pond appeared to be full of sediment. The material from the Type II basin was scheduled to be removed during the week of the inspection. Department staff called Matt Carcaba and Kathie Chumley. Matt stated that the sediment basin had been cleaned out and the material was being removed off site.
- 9. **Effluent Quality:** RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 10. Effluent Disposal: RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 10.1 Observation: The Type II basins appeared to be in compliance
- 11. Biosolids/Sludge: RATING IN COMPLIANCE
 - 11.1 Observation: Materials were being disposed of in accordance with the permit.
- 12. Groundwater Quality: RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 13. **SSO Survey:** RATING NOT APPLICABLE
- 14. Other: RATING NOT APPLICABLE



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [COMPLAINT/I ARMS COMPL	DISCOVERY (CI)		
ΑI	RS ID#: 0830132 DATE: 7/29/13	ARRIVE:	DEPART	` :	
FA	CILITY NAME: FLORIDA ROCK INDUSTRIE	ES/OCALA PLANT			
FA	CILITY LOCATION: 3599 SW 74TH AVE	E			
	OCALA 34474-64:	.52			
CO	OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: KATHIE CHUMLEY Email: ChumleyK@VMC.com CONTACT NAME: MATT CARCABA Email: CarcabaM@VMC.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/21/2011 / 4/21/2016 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (904)380-0130 Mobile: PHONE: (800)342-1077 Mobile: (352)494-7279				
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): Benje Schmo Brief Notes:			(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still KATHIE CH If no, who is?:	IUMLEY?		⊠ Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative Is the facility contact still MATT CARCABA? If no, who is?:				□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today' If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least				⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 – CCB Plant-batcher/loadout w/central baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

PΛ	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
1. 2.	Date of last inspection: 5/11/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	DELY, DANGE DANGE DANG AND A CARACTERIAN FAC		
<u>PA</u>	RT II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		
	confined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and		
Coi	nveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards		
	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:	ed	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1 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?	- X Yes	☐ No
	owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	- X 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
	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-split silo (cement) w/individual silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
Date of last inspection: 5/11/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \[\Delta \text{N/A} \] c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
DIDENT TO CONCERNATIONS OF A CARCALLAND FAC		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>		
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Foints, Roads, Farking Areas, Stock Files, and Tarus		
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfine emissions by:	d	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the fo		
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	⊠ Yes	☐ No
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
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
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-split silo (slag) w/individual silotop baghouse subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
Date of last inspection: 5/11/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \[\Delta \text{N/A} \] c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
DIDENT TO CONCERNATIONS OF A CARCALLAND FAC		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>		
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Foints, Roads, Farking Areas, Stock Files, and Tarus		
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfine emissions by:	d	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the fo		
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 	⊠ Yes	☐ No
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
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
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		

Emissions Unit Section
5 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop baghouse, 82T vertical subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	
1. Date of last inspection: 5/11/2010 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
THE THE OBSERVATION AND SERVICE AND SERVIC	ļ
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	
Conveying 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? Yes	☐ No
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to	
control emissions?	∐ No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the	ļ
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	□ No
particulate matter from stock piles? \ Yes	□ No
particulate matter from stock piles? 🔼 Tes	
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? 🛛 Yes	□ No
b. Ose of spring our, entite, or partial encrosure to integer emissions at the group point to the decision of	
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:	
a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes	☐ No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? Yes	☐ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-cement scale w/individual central dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	
1. Date of last inspection: 5/11/2010 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
DADT II. FIFI D ODCEDNATIONS Dula (2.204.414(2)) F.A.C.	
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>	
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Foints, Roads, Farking Areas, Stock Files, and Tards	
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:	
Management of contract of the contract of the first of th	
 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?	□ 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?	☐ 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
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes	□ No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? Yes	☐ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	

Facility Section (continued)

	<u> </u>				
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			only one question)	
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?	\boxtimes	Yes 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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo	
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal proparation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal proparation of gas/yr 45 MM gal proparation o	ne/yr		?	
Gl	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?	- 🖂	Yes	☐ No	
	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?	- 🛛		□ No	
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		Yes	□ No	

R	ELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	only one
1.	Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the follow</i>	box for each ving question 2.)	• '
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		☐ 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. 62-210.90] 		☐ No
	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]	Yes	☐ No
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation	n? Yes	☐ No
3.	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pand 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 use		☐ No
	If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?		□ No
Ì	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	☐ No
Cl	<u>HANGES</u>	(check ☑ box for each	
	dministrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represe		question)
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions	units or	
2.	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?		⊠ No □ No
Ne	ew 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?	\(\text{Yes}	⊠ No
	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?	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee s 30 days prior to the change?	ubmitted Yes	☐ No
La	auren Staly 7/29/13		
	Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
	n/a		
_	Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next		

COMMENTS: The facility appears to be in good condition. Materials from the Type II basins are being removed this week.