CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Environmental Compliance

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☒ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐

RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 7775534 **DATE:** **11/10/08** **ARRIVE:** **10:16am** **DEPART:** **1:12pm**

FACILITY NAME: PEACE R RESERVOIR PROJECT-RELO CCB PLANT

FACILITY LOCATION: 8999 SW CR 769

ARCADIA 34629-

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: GERRY ARVIDSON **PHONE:** (863)491-7415

CONTACT NAME: Steven Kidd **PHONE:** (863)491-7415

ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/26/2008 (effective date) / 9/26/2013 (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 60days 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	11/10/08
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
	2/4/2009
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: This is a new facility. According to Mr. Steven Kidd the facility will be in this location for about 6 months. Discussed emission points description information requirements and point #'s , as well as relocation notice requirements in entitlement, and showed Mr. Steven Kidd where to find relocation notices on the DEP website. Provided DEP web addresses for GP forms, Air rules, and compliance assistance. Discussed visible emissions (VE) testing requirements for worst case scenario on 11/07/08. VE testing was conducted on 11/10/2008 at 11:00 am the testing included simultaneous loading of split silo, but the mixing unit was not operating. Initial operation for the facility has not begun, yet. The silo loaded about 26 tons which is a partial load initially last week 11/05/08. I went over checklist questions with facility representative Mr. Steven Kidd. They do own a water truck, but the subcontractors also share this responsibility. No sprinklers are on site. Facility does not load trucks through silo drop area directly. Explained that the facility may need to test conveyor drop points. The baghouse vent at this location would be best tested in the early morning due to vent exit location. I explained briefly how VE testing must have the right sun angle and had the consultant representative (Ryan) demonstrate sun angle for testing. I told Mr. Kidd I would speak with Danielle Henry, compliance manager to determine the possible requirement of testing drop points and contact him as soon as possible. I also told Mr. Kidd that he could fax a copy of the full delivery information to me when he gets a delivery. He agreed to do that and delivery information was included with VE test report submittal. After discussions with Danielle Henry and Mara Nasca, Air Program Administrator, it was determined that the facility will need to retest their central dust collector once moisture content is determined and the facility begins operations. On December 2, Mr. Kidd contacted me to let me know that the facility will commence operating on 12/05/2008. VE testing will be witnessed by Department staff to determine if testing of drop points will be necessary. The second set of VE tests will be conducted on Monday, February 4, 2009. Photos were taken during my visit and are attached to this inspection report.