



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

AIRS ID#: 1010075 **DATE:** 4-15-09 **ARRIVE:** 8:15am **DEPART:** 9:41 am

FACILITY NAME: ZEPHYRHILLS PLANT

FACILITY LOCATION: 3749 COPELAND DR.
 ZEPHYRHILLS 33540-0000

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ERIC MYERS **PHONE:** (813)783-1970

CONTACT NAME: Craig Henry **PHONE:** 8137831970

ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/29/2009 / 01/29/2014
 (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

04-15-09

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

04/15/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Pre-inspection Review: Testing was scheduled for EU# 7 on this date. On 4-14-09, I contacted Arlington to discuss testing. I informed Debra Carter that Emission unit (EU) #7 was already tested in February 2009. I emailed a copy of the facility diagram to Debra for their files. Inspection findings: Upon my arrival the testing was already underway, so I spoke with Mr. Ryan Peterson of Arlington Environmental and he confirmed that the silo being filled and tested had already been tested in 2/2009. Mr. Peterson and I discussed EU numbers while at silo site and with Mr. Craig Henry and Mr. Clinton Sutton. A diagram was drawn on the facility's conference room white board and Mr. Henry asked Mr. Sutton to renumber the EU's to match the DEP EU numbers. Mr. Henry was able to locate 2006 VE testing that is missing from the Department's files for the facility and provided a copy to me. Mr. Henry stated they are still looking for 2005 VE testing and will send it to us if they can find it. I explained enforcement referral would be sent to DEP's enforcement department and there would potentially be an enforcement case for issues notified on the January 2009 Field Warning Notice. I asked Mr. Henry for start-up dates for each of the 3 new emission units EU#'s 6, 7, and 8. Mr. Henry stated that he did not have that information off the top of his head for EU 6 and 7, but EU #8 has not begun operating, yet. Mr. Henry stated the facility anticipates that unit will begin operating sometime within the next 60 days. I informed Mr. Henry that testing should be conducted on that unit during the first loading of the silo. Mr. Henry stated that was their plan. Mr. Henry asked how the facility should submit the missing testing and the start-up dates and I stated these remaining issues, could be settled via email. Mr. Henry then committed to e-mailing or faxing 2005 testing (if it could be found) and research the start-up dates for EU's 6 and 7. Mr. Henry stated the 2005 and 2006 testing were likely conducted by an employee of Old Castle. On November 2, 2009, I contacted Mr. Henry because he still had not followed-up on request for start-up dates on EU #7 and 8. Mr. Henry stated that he still did not know a start up date for EU#7, but EU #8 had just recently started-up withing the last month. See Conversation Record in file.