



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

AIRS ID#: 7775208 **DATE:** 07/15/2009 **ARRIVE:** 8:10am **DEPART:** 11:25am
FACILITY NAME: XPRESS MATERIALS LLC-WILDWOOD PLANT
FACILITY LOCATION: 8302 NE 44th DR
 WILDWOOD 34785
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: CLAUDE GRAHAM **PHONE:** (476)272-9990
CONTACT NAME: Karl Kimmons **PHONE:** (352)748-2200
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/5/2008 / 7/5/2013
 (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

06/29/2009

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

06/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Pre-inspection review: According to ARM's, this facility conducted Visible Emissions (VE) testing on July 16, 2008 on just 4 of the six emission units currently registered. In 2006 and 2007 the facility tested 6 emission units (EU). The last inspection conducted at this facility was on 07/23/2007, which is the day the 2007 VE testing was conducted. According to a review of these test reports, the loading of the cement silo was conducted at a rate below entitlement required 25 TPH.

Inspection Findings: Sprinklers were in operation upon my arrival at the facility. Visible Emissions (VE) testing had begun on the Central Dust Collector at the wet plant. Mr. Karl Kimmons, Lead Batch Man, escorted me around the facility and provided responses for inspection checklist questions. According to Mr. Kimmons, the facility has a water truck and a sweeper that are operated in conjunction with each other as needed. The facility's parking lot and paved roadways were wet, but not completely free of particulate. Mike Moore is the Production Manager for the facility. Photos were taken during my visit and are attached to this report. According to the Department database this facility has 6 emission units (EU). 2 EU's are associated with the wet plant: a Central Dust Collector (CDC) which controls the loading of the combination silo and the truck load out, and a weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector which is located inside the silo tower. The dry plant has 4 EU's. They are: 1 weigh hopper dust collector; 1 Flyash silo w/silo top dust collector; 1 Cement silo w/silo top dust collector; and the CDC for the truck loadout. I issued a FWN for 2 missing VE tests in 2008 on EU's 3 and 6. It should be noted that EU 1 was tested at a low rate in 2007. I did point this out to Mr. Kimmons. I explained to Mr. Kimmons that due to sun angle requirements for Method 9 VE testing, the weigh batcher may need to be tested in the afternoon while the truck load out may need to be tested in the morning. Mr. Kimmons inquired about the facility being able to conduct testing themselves. I described the process of Method 9 VE testing briefly and provided him with a copy of the ETA brochure and he looked up their website. The 2009 Annual VE Testing was submitted on August 21, 2009 and included all emission units at the facility.