



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



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

AIRS ID#: 1010376 **DATE:** 09/29/08 **ARRIVE:** 10:41am **DEPART:** 12:33pm
FACILITY NAME: KEYS CONCRETE RM-5/EHREN CUT-OFF
FACILITY LOCATION: 11121 Ehren Cut-off Road
LAND O LAKES 34639-8123
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JEFFREY PORTER **PHONE:** (561)820-8415
CONTACT NAME: Chuck Wheeler **PHONE:** (813)996-1012
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 5/28/2006 / 5/28/2011
(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

09/29/2008

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: This facility's Visible Emissions (VE) testing for 2007 and 2008 did not include all permitted emission units. Last INS 2 was conducted on 9/21/2006 by Joe Panetta and facility seemed to be in compliance. The 2007 VE testing did not include VE's for both dust collectors on the weigh hoppers; issued Field Warning Notice. Emissions from charging/mixing areas on Block plants are controlled by a separate dust collector from the silo dust collectors. Spoke with Mr. Chuck Wheeler who was not plant manager. Mr. Wheeler stated that Mr. Sherwin Hatfield Jr., is the plant manager. Mr. Hatfield was at an OSHA training out of town. Mr. Wheeler stated the block plant was shutdown from around Thanksgiving 2006 to January 2008. The Ready mix plant continued to operate until ~Feb. 2008; then it shut down also. When asked, Mr. Wheeler said he believes the sweeper comes by once a month, the facility checks baghouses once per month, and they change the bags as needed. The 2008 VE test report, indicates it was conducted on the block plant but only one VE test was submitted and the facility has 2 different block plants with at least 2 EU's each. Mr. Wheeler informed me that the 2nd block plant was never built so EU's 9, & 10 do not require testing. A new cuber and new block buster (mini crusher) have been installed since last inspect, both of these units are exempt from permitting. According to Mr. Wheeler, the facility uses an average of 3,000 gallons of low sulfur diesel fuel per month. Mike Downing is the Ready mix plant manager his contact phone number is 727-862-4602. Mr. Wheeler stated the Block plant produced ~ 36,200 tons of product this year. Field Warning Notice was issued for missing EU test on Block plant. Sprinklers were present and operational during my visit. Block plant #3 was operating, no VE 's were noted during my site visit. On 10/12/2008, facility re-registered for a change of ownership to CEMEX. The new registration indicates only 7 EU's instead of 10. This change in ownership registration does not indicate 2 dust collectors on the weigh hopper. I spoke with Jason Jones on 11/18/2008. He will re-register facility to reflect 2nd baghouse on weigh hopper for RM plant, which will become EU8 . EU's 9 & 10 have been inactivated. Mr. Jones will submit startup/shutdown dates for all units and resubmit VE tests with appropriate EU #'s since 2007 testing may be missing for some units.