



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



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

<b>AIRS ID#:</b> 1310256		<b>DATE:</b> <u>2/24/2006</u>	<b>ARRIVE:</b> _____	<b>DEPART:</b> _____
<b>FACILITY NAME:</b> DEFUNIAK SPRINGS PAVER PLANT				
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 28 Gene Hurley Rd DEFUNIAK SPRINGS 32433				
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:</b> ALLEN FAULK			<b>PHONE:</b> (334)673-8233	
<b>CONTACT NAME:</b> Rusty Craig			<b>PHONE:</b> (850)892-9649	
<b>REMITTANCE YEAR:</b>		<b>ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:</b> 2/19/2006 / 2/19/2011 <small>(effective date) (end date)</small>		

**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

Charles Norman

2/24/2006

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

10-14 months

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** 1. The facility is non-compliant for late testing of the central dust collector. An Air General Permit Notification Form, Part III, for the addition of the third silo, known as the Slag silo, and the addition of a central dust collector for the collection and exhaust of dust from inside the plant was received July 1, 2005. The Slag silo was installed on September 22, 2005 and passed visible emissions testing October 3, 2005. The central dust collection was also installed per the Air General Permit Notification Form, Part III, received July 1, 2005, but it was not tested until February 24, 2005. Mr. Craig said the missed test was an oversight. He also said that the system had not been used very much since installation. One reason was that it would exhaust the heat from the building and run up winter heating bill. During the February 24, 2006 test, emissions from this emissions unit were 0% opacity.

2. The Department received an Air General Permit Notification Form, Part III, on January 19, 2006, for the addition of a dust control system for the tumbler. The tumbler system began operation on February 10, 2006. The new notification required that testing be done on all the emissions units within 60 days after the receipt of the notification. Pensacola P.O.C. performed these tests during the February 24, 2006 inspection. Results were 0% opacity for all the emissions units.

3. The new tumbler system is used to give pavers an aged look. Pavers are loaded into the tumbler and tumbled for 8 minutes. Once the tumbling process is complete, the "aged" pavers are fed onto a conveyor, which drops them into large bags for storage and shipping. A large shroud connected to a dust collector covers the open end of the tumbler. No visible emissions were seen from this operation except a small amount of fugitive emissions from the opening at the bottom of the shroud where the pavers drop onto the conveyor belt. I did a regulatory visible emissions test on these emissions. The results were 17.3% opacity. The general visible emissions limit of 20% applies to these emissions. Mr. Craig said he had some ideas for further controlling emissions. One was to enclose the entire operation in a building and then use a dust collector to control the emissions from the building. At the present, the operation sets out in the open, exposed to the elements.

4. No other fugitive emissions were seen plant or yard operations despite an 8-10 mph wind. The entire yard working and storage area for the pavers is paved. Mr. Craig said that the company has a sweeper under contract to sweep the yard weekly. Material piles are protected from the wind by walls.

COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Department is closing the central dust collector late testing violation without further action since the equipment was not used extensively, and the February 24, 2006 test results were 0% opacity.
2. The fugitive emissions from the bottom of the shroud passed the visible emissions test by a small margin. Recommend ways to control these emissions be further investigated.
3. Schedule the next round of visible emissions testing for this facility to be done during the 60-day period prior to January 19, 2007. The Department must be notified at least 15 days prior to the scheduled tests. Notification of the testing may be made by email to the following address: [NWDAIR@dep.state.fl.us](mailto:NWDAIR@dep.state.fl.us).