WHERTAL PROTECTION
Some Cane
FLORIDA
FLORIDA

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [COMPLAINT/DISCOVI						
AIRS ID#: 7775494 DATE: <u>1/15/09</u> FACILITY NAME: MILTON CCB PLANT	ARRIVE: <u>10:20 am</u>	DEPART: <u>10:38 am</u>					
FACILITY LOCATION: DA LISA RD MILTON 32583							
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: K CONTACT NAME: Jason Harwood ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/22/2008 / 3/22/20 (effective date) (end date	PHON	E: (850)682-4269 E: 682-4269					
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
 PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIE</u> (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) <u>Stack Emissions</u> Were visible emissions tests conducted during to 62-297, F.A.C.)? Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batch controlled to the extent necessary to limit visib During visible emissions tests of the silo dust controlled to the extent necessary to limit visib During visible emissions tests of the normal sild unless such rate is unachievable in practice?4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) to this question is "Yes", then continue on to question 5 a) Was the batching operation in operation during b) During the visible emissions test, was the backing operation?	this site visit according to EPA M mers), and other enclosed storage a le emissions to 5 percent opacity? ollector exhaust points was the lo ploading rate, or at least at the mi poperation controlled by the silo of uestions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If an 5.)	Iethod 9 (Ref.: Chapter □Yes □ No and conveying equipment ? □Yes □ No bading of the silo conducted nimum 25 tons per hour rate, □Yes □ No dust collector? (If answer hswer is "No" then □Yes □ No normal batching rate and □Yes □ No collector, which is separate batcher) dust collector					

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.) 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 Yes 				
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?				
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 60days prior to the ACB Natification form submission and within 60 days prior to each anniversary data? 				
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: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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? (<i>Please check ⊠only one box.</i>)					
 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? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.</i>)					
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? 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: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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) p	paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? [Yes] No
2) a	application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
e	emissions? [Yes] No
3) r	emoval of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to
r	re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? [Yes] No
4) r	reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of
I	particulate matter from stock piles? 🖾 Yes 🗌 No
) use	of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? XYes 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?----- D) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?-----

0)		103	
c)	replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most		
	recent notification form?	Yes	No No
d)	If you answered <u>YES</u> 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

Chris Stoll

b

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

1/15/09 Date of Inspection

1/15/2010

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: On January 15, 2009, an un-announced compliance inspection was performed at the B&H Contracting Inc. concrete batching plant located in Milton, Florida. The facility was operating at the time of the inspection. This was the first compliance inspection since the facility began operating in September 2008. I met with Mr. Jason Harwood, who is the plant manager. Mr. Harwood showed me the emission control components of the plant, which consists of one dust collector. The dust collector controls emissions from the cement silo. Unconfined emissions from the site are controlled using water and by maintaining the height of materials in the stock pile bins. A Pollution Abatement Guideline was submitted with the permit registration form that list operation and maintenance activities the operators will use to control pollution from the plant.

Mr. Harwood was unaware that a visual emission test was required 30 days after beginning operation and annually thereafter. Florida Administrative Code, Chapter 62.296.414(4)(a), requires that the owner or operator of any concrete batching plant using an air general permit shall have a EPA Method 9 performance test conducted for visible emissions for each dust collector exhaust point no later then thirty (30) days after commencing operation, and annually thereafter.

Prior to having the visible emissions test conducted, the owner or operator shall notify the department, at least 15 days prior to the date on which the formal compliance test is to begin, of the date, time, and place of each such test, and the test contact person who will be responsible for coordinating and having such test conducted for the owner or operator. This notification can be made via e-mail to nwdair@dep,state.fl.us once the visible emission test is set up.

A Visible Emission EPA Method 9 test needs to be performed as soon as possible to determine compliance with the general air 5% opacity limit.