



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

AIRS ID#: 7775600 **DATE:** 10/26/2009 **ARRIVE:** 9:38 am **DEPART:** 11:15am
FACILITY NAME: PEACE RIVER WATER TREATMENT PLANT
FACILITY LOCATION: 8998 SW CR 769
 ARCADIA 34269-8197
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ROBERT "BOBBY" OYENARTE **PHONE:** (352)372-3436
CONTACT NAME: Apidet Phromviyo **PHONE:** (352)262-3748
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/13/2009 / 8/13/2014
(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

10/26/2009

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

11/18/2009

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Pre-inspection Information: During the filling of this silo on 09/16/2009, the silo unit's pressure release valve discharged and began emitting particulate. The test was stopped to check the valve. This unit had the same malfunction during the first attempt of initial testing and the test could not be completed. During the September 16, 2009, test attempt, it was discovered that the silo has a manual electric shaker for the bags. It was determined that the lack of shaking the bags could have contributed to pressure build-up in the silo. Additionally, the unloading of 26.46 tons of cement took more than 1.5 hours. The Department determined the facility should retest. The retest is scheduled to begin at 9:30am. Inspection Findings: Upon my arrival, the facility contact informed me they placed wet towels over the pressure release valve to help prevent particulate release if the valve blew. I requested that the wet towels be removed. I explained there maybe some issue with the equipment that is causing it to malfunction. Testing began at 9:33am . Truck unloaded 11.96 tons of cement in 35 minutes, a rate of approximately 20.52 TPH. At the end of the load, while the truck was clearing the hoses, the pressure release valve blew and particulate was observed coming from the silo. This is the 4th test attempt for this facility's initial testing. Every test attempt has had a pressure valve release at or near the end of the loading session. I told Mr. Phromviyo that I would need to discuss these issues with SW District Management to see how the Department wants the facility to proceed next. According to Mr. Phromviyo the truck driver allowed the pressure to get to high while he was blowing the hoses and that is what caused the issue with the silo. I requested that someone check the bags to see if they were still in good condition and properly placed. Mr. Phromviyo stated the bags were all in good condition and properly hanging in the unit. Additionally, I requested that Mr. Phromviyo contact the truck driver to find out how high the pressure was when he was blowing the hoses out. According to Mr. Phromviyo, the driver stated the pressure did not exceed 12 psi and furthermore, the pressure during the cleaning out of the hoses was only 7 psi. This may indicate there is a maintenance issue with the silo. On 10/29/2009, I contacted Mr. Bobby Oyenarte to discuss the issues with the low rate testing and the Department's concerns for the pressure release valve events. When asked, Mr. Oyenarte stated the project at the Peace River Reservoir is scheduled to be completed by December 15, 2009. See conversation record for full details. The Department requested that The Crom Corporation not load this silo again until another test can be conducted. Testing was rescheduled for 11/18/2009. Inspector Simmons will witness testing.

