

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2 RE-INSPECTION (FU	_	DISCOVERY (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 1210017 DATE: <u>1/10/12</u>	ARRIVE:	DEPART:		
FACILITY NAME: COLUMBIA READY-MIX	CONCRETE INC			
FACILITY LOCATION: 300 PALM ST N	NE			
LIVE OAK 32	2064-4827			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE Email: readie@crmconcrete.com CONTACT NAME: FLETCHER MILLS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/10/2011 / 9/ (effective date) (en	E: RENNY EADIE /10/2016	PHONE: (386)755-2458 Mobile: PHONE: (386)362-4422 Mobile:		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
DADT II. ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEET	INC			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETI 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes:	<u>ING</u>	,	☑ only one ach question)	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still RENNY If no, who is?:	EADIE?	× Yes	□No	
If different, did the facility provide an administ 3. Is the facility contact still FLETCHER MILLS If no, who is?:			□No □No	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during to If yes, was the compliance authority notified at			□No □No	

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
		`	•
1.	Date of last inspection: $5/18/2011$	box for each	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	☐ No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		No No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	_	
	operation?	☐ Yes	□No
	d. Date of last VE test: 5/18/11		
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	⊠ Yes	□ No
	f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		□ No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 25 tons/hour	<u> </u>	
	h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	Yes	□ No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		□ No
		LITES	M N0
	j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	V.	□ Na
	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	∐ No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
-	DELY CELCULAR CONTROL		
PA	ART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
4	XX	□ 3 7	
1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	- Yes	□ No
	b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	_	
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	- Yes	☐ No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?	_	_
	, <u> </u>		
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co	onducted at a r	ate
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loa		
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
	g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	□No
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go to	_	
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra		
	duration?		☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.		
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		
	2) What was the hatching rate? tons/hour. What was the hatching duration? minut	es	
2	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		⊠ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes Yes	□ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes Yes	
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/11		4
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	V.	□ Na
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		∐ No ⊠ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	- I i es	⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: <u>5/18/11</u>		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?		□ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	- X Yes	∐ No
 g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 25 tons/hour h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state 		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	⊠ Yes	□ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		No No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	_	
DADEN CELEVISION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	- Yes	⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	- Yes	□ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	- Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	_	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo of the sil		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	L Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate?tons/hour	□ Vac	□ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go t	∐ Yes	∐ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching in		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mir	utes	_
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	ch is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		N
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		No No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	- Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	\ Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	- <u> </u>	
d. What was the process rate:tons/nour.		

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/11 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	n)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	O
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	0
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	
	O
operation:	, O
d. Date of last VE test: 5/18/11	Ü
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? Yes N	O
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? Yes	O
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	
	0
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? Yes N	0
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? Yes N	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	U
If not, what was the problem (if known).	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other (check ☑ only o	ne
enclosed storage and conveying equipment box for each question	n)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit? Yes X	O
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes No. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	O
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes	· 0
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	O
d. 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? Yes No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection	•
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? Yes	O
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? \square Yes \square N If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to h.	О
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? Yes N	· 0
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and	O
duration?	O
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? Yes	O
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? Yes a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes N	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes No. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	U
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes	o l
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	-

Emissions Unit Section 4 -CCB Plant-trk loadout/loading hoppr w/dust collection system subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/11 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No No No No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Yes	□ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	☐ Yes	⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	☐ Yes	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	□ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A - silo not load	ded during ins	pection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	· ∐ Yes	☐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.	Yes Yes	□ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	☐ No

Facility Section (continued)

_			1
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ✓ box for each	only one h question)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
4.	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propar. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ne/yr	□ No
CENERAL CONDUCTIONS			
Gi	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ⊻ box for each	only one h question)
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	_	□ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ (only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following</i>	box for each o	•
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	☐ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] 	Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	☐ Yes	☐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	Yes	☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation perm and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage) If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was		☐ No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check 🗹 o	
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representate associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unit operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	ts or Yes	⊠ No □ No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?	Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee subn 30 days prior to the change?	mitted Yes	☐ No
Stuart Bartlett 1/10/11		
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection	

COMMENTS: Facility was batching trucks during inspection and was preparing to pump off a tanker truck of cement. No visible emissions were observed.