



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



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

ARMS UPDATED

02/09/10 NB

AIRS ID#: 0810216 **DATE:** 02/08/2010 **ARRIVE:** 1425 **DEPART:** 1450

FACILITY NAME: BRADENTON FACILITY

FACILITY LOCATION: 7080 28th ST CT E
SARASOTA 34243

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: **PHONE:**

CONTACT NAME: Daryl Leiding **PHONE:** (727)385-6103

ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/26/2008 / 4/26/2013
(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

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?~~ ^{annually by 12/31}----- 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

Nedin Bahtic

02/08/2010

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Nedin Bahtic

02/08/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Note: All questions left unanswered do not apply.

The facility did not perform visible emission testing during calendar year 2009, so a Field Warning Notice was issued. Mr. Leiding stated that this was due to the fact that Mr. Ron Molter, facility's Operations Manager, is no longer with the company, and he was the person responsible for test scheduling. A suggestion was made to Mr. Leiding that the visible emission testing be conducted as soon as possible; Mr. Leiding agreed.

Stabil Concrete has two silos on site: one (EU 001) is used for white and other (EU 002) is used for gray cement. No fugitive emissions were noticed.

This facility does not appear to be in compliance. An enforcement referral will be prepared once the VE testing has been completed.



Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Southwest District Office

FIELD WARNING NOTICE

Name / Owner / Operator: Stabil Concrete
Address: 7080 28th St, Ct. E
Location / Source: Concrete batch plant
Permit Number: 0810216-002-AG Permit Exp. Date: 04/26/13 Date and Time: 02/08/10 1445

The purpose of this notice is to advise you of possible violations of law for which you may be responsible, and to seek your cooperation in resolving the matter. Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) personnel conducted a field inspection on the date listed above at the location described above. Florida DEP personnel observed the following, which indicates that a violation of Florida Statutes and Rules may exist at the above described facility: (For example, Where was the activity observed? How was it discovered? Who provided information to the inspector?)

Observations: No visible emission testing conducted during calendar year 2009.

Rule or Statute Relevant to Observations

Permit Condition No.

Table with 2 columns: Rule or Statute Relevant to Observations, Permit Condition No. Rows include: Unconfined Particulate Matter, Operating Without a Permit, Violation of Permit Condition(s), Objectionable Odor, Excessive Visible Emissions, Open Burning, Constructing Without a Permit, and Other (checked) Rule 62-296.414(4)(b), F.A.C.

The activities observed during the Department's field inspection and any other activities at your facility that may be contributing to violations of the above-described statutes or rules should be ceased. The operation of a facility in violation of state statutes or rules may result in liability for damages and restoration, and the administrative imposition of penalties up to \$10,000.00 pursuant to Section 403.121, Florida Statutes (F.S.), or the judicial imposition of civil penalties up to \$10,000.00 per violation per day pursuant to Sections 403.141 and 403.161, F.S.

You are requested to contact NEDIN BAHITIC at the address or telephone number below within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Field Warning Notice. Please be advised that this Field Warning Notice is part of an agency investigation, preliminary to agency action in accordance with Section 120.57(5), F.S. We look forward to your cooperation in completing the investigation and resolution of this matter.

Received by: [Signature] Issued / Posted by: Nedin Bahitic
Print: D. Leiding Print: NEDIN BAHITIC
Title: Plant Manager