



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



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

**AIRS ID#:** 7775315 **DATE:** 10/29/2008 **ARRIVE:** 2:03 pm **DEPART:** 2:10pm  
**FACILITY NAME:** C & M ROAD BUILDERS, INC.  
**FACILITY LOCATION:** 6520 33rd Street East  
SARASOTA 34243  
**OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:** MARK MCCABE **PHONE:** (941)758-1933  
**CONTACT NAME:** **PHONE:**  
**ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 3/2/2006 / 3/2/2011  
(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

Wendy D. Simmons

10/29/2008

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

03/25/2009

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** Pre-inspection review: Entitlement began on 3/2/06. This facility was found operating w/o entitlement in 10/25/05. Last VE testing was conducted on 01/04/06. Found no testing for 2007. ARM's says 1 EU with several points. If operating, need to issue FWN for 2007 testing. If not at this location, need FWN for moving without notifying. Inspection findings: Lot at location indicated above was empty. Photos were taken of empty lot during my visit to the site. No equipment was at this location and the gates closed and locked. I contacted Mr. Mark McCabe on 2/12/2009 and left a voice mail for him to contact me. I spoke with Mr. McCabe at 10am on 02/12/2009. See attached conversation record. Equipment is currently located in North Port, Florida. Mr. McCabe will forward relocation notices from 2006 to date to me on Monday 02/16/2009. Mark stated he would call me to discuss a date and time for conducting a compliance assistance meeting and inspection on the equipment. Spoke with Mr McCabe on 02/17/2009. See attached conversation record. This facility is currently out of the SWD jurisdiction in Sarasota County. I informed Mr. McCabe that the facility is out of compliance, but I have not scheduled a combined Sarasota/SWD inspection. Mr. McCabe stated all his facilities except one are currently at the North Port yard location. The last unit (crushing facility) may return to main yard sometime in December 2008. On March 25, 2009, Visible Emissions testing was conducted on this facility and I witnessed testing, conducted and inspection and compliance assistance with Mr. Bob Knowlton. Please see inspection report dated 03/25/2009.