



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

**AIRS ID#:** 7775339 **DATE:** 10/29/2008 **ARRIVE:** 2:25 pm **DEPART:** 3:02 pm

**FACILITY NAME:** SOIL CEMENT PLANT

**FACILITY LOCATION:**  
 NORTHPORT 34289

**OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:** TOM LIGHTCAP **PHONE:** (941)755-2850

**CONTACT NAME:** **PHONE:**

**ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 7/10/2006 / 7/10/2011  
 (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

10/29/2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
Inspector's Name (Please Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Inspection

\_\_\_\_\_  
Inspector's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** Pre-inspection Review: 1EU - 4 Emission Points. Last Visible Emissions(VE) Testing was conducted on 8/24/2006. No inspection has been conducted at this facility since it was registered in 7/10/2006. No record of 2007 or 2008 VE Testing was found for this facility. Need to verify Emission unit/point information, start-up dates, and if necessary shutdown dates. If facility has been moved, aField Warning Notice(FWN) should be issued for lack of relocation notifications. If no VE'S were conducted at this facility in 2007 or 2008, and they are or were operating, a FWN should be issued for missing 2007and 2008 testing. If facility is shutdown a letter should be sent to the Department explaining missing testing and should include start-up/shutdown dates and request for relinquishing their permit. Inspection Findings: Upon my arrival at the site, Mr. John Johnson greeted me, in the Superior Asphalt parking lot. Mr. John Johnson stated that the facility was sold to Rapid International (Contact: Dennis Bauer) at 303-833-0068. Mr. Johnson stated this sale took place about 8-18-2008. Mr. Johnson also stated he thinks this plant last operated in May of 2008. I explained the lack of testing at the plant for 2007 and 2008. I requested that Superior Asphalt provide VE Test Reports, locations it operated since 2006, and copies of test notifications as well as operating records for 2007 and 2008. I issued a Field Warning Notice (FWN) and gave him a copy of Concrete Batch Plant entitlement registration information. I also informed Mr. Johnson that each time the plant moved to a new location the plant should have sent the Department a notice of relocation. Mr. Johnson stated he would need to get the information from Mr. Tom Lightcap , who was not in the office. I issued a FWN for missing 2007 and 2008 VE testing. On 11/11/08, Mr. Lightcap contacted me via phone to discuss FWN I issued during my 10/29/08 inspection. On 11/17/08 I spoke with Mr. Lightcap ... see attached Conversation Record. After reviewing operating records from Mr. Lightcap received at the DEP on 11/19/08, I determined an enforcement referral should be completed for missing testing in 2007 and 2008 as well as the lack of relocation notices for the facility in 2007 and 2008. Included with operation records was a letter relinquishing the permit for this facility. The facility needs to be inactivated in ARM's. No future inspection is planned for this facility and no photos were taken during my site inspection.