



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

AIRS ID#: 1010007 **DATE:** 09/29/2008 **ARRIVE:** 9:11 am **DEPART:** 10:13am
FACILITY NAME: CEMEX CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS, L.P.
FACILITY LOCATION: 1714 N. Dale Mabry
 LUTZ 33548-3013
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JASON JONES **PHONE:** (813)269-1240
CONTACT NAME: Alex Tongan **PHONE:** (813)949-3628
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/18/2007 / 8/18/2012
(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

- Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?----- Yes No
- 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
- 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
- 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
 - Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?----- Yes No
 - During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?----- Yes No
- 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

09/29/2008

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

9/29/2010

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Pre-inspection Review: VE Testing was conducted on 9/9/08 for emission units 3, 5, 6, 8, and a weigh hopper dust collector that is not registered in AG permit. The slag silo EU #7 was tested on 11/5/2008. Inspection Findings: According to Mr. Tongan, Plant Operator, the slag silo has not been operational for 3 or 4 months. Facility was loading trucks during my visit. Fuel records indicate they use between 3 and 400 gallons of fuel per day. Sweeper comes by once per week. Mr. Tongan stated they have no water truck only long hoses. Sprinklers were present on piles and in operation during my visit. When I asked, Alex Tongan stated they clean out the IW lagoons about 2 times per week and the bags on dust collectors are changed about once every 6 months. According to Mr. Tongan, this facility has a baghouse on each silo, the central dust collector(CDC) for the truck load out, and the dust collector on the weigh batcher. This means there are 5 emission units instead of only 4. I will need to contact Jason Jones to have the facility re-register. The facility usually processes 11,250 lbs. material per month and fuel delivery notice was supplied upon request verifying fuel sulfur content meets entitlement requirements. Photos were taken during my visit at the facility and are attached to this inspection report. I contacted Jason Jones on 12/1/08 to ask about the dust collector on the weigh batcher. He said he would call Arlington to find out about weigh batcher dust collector. Upon reviewing facility permit records, ARM's indicates EU03 was the weigh batcher dust collector. This unit was not included in the August 2008 permit registration so it was inactivated when 9/08 registration became active. On January 14, 2009 this facility re-registered with the Department and now has 5 active emission units in ARM's. The reason for the delay in re-registering this facility to include the missing weigh hopper was an act of vandalism on the facility. This information is described in detail in the facility's compliance file with conversation records and e-mails beginning January 9, 2009. Photos were taken durig my visit to this site and are attached to this inspection report.