

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	ISPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/	DISCOVERY (CI)		S UPDATED
Al	IRS ID#: 0810006 DA	TE: <u>12/12/11</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1015</u>	DEPART	: <u>1035</u>	
FA	ACILITY NAME: PA	LMETTO RM & BLOCK F	FACILITY			
FA	ACILITY LOCATION	: 600 9TH ST W				
		PALMETTO, FL	34221			
CO	WNER/AUTHORIZE Email: jasonp.jones@ ONTACT NAME: JA Email: jasonp.jones@ NTITLEMENT PERIC	ASON JONES Deemex.com	2/2013	PHONE: (813)269-12 Mobile: (813)363-61 PHONE: (813)269-12 Mobile: (813)363-61	112 240	
PA	Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
		RODUCTORY MEETING resentative(s): Mike Foote,		1-722-3032)	(check 🗹 box for each	
2.	Is the Authorized Repril If no, who is?:	esentative still JASON JON	ES?	·	⊠ Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility contact st If no, who is?:	ility provide an administratitill JASON JONES?	ve update within 30 days	?	- ☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.		ting VE test(s) during today nce authority notified at least				⊠No □No

Emissions Unit Section 10 -CCB Plant-BLOCK silo (cement) w/cartridge dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

	Date of last inspection: 01/27/09 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
2.	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing	✓ Yes✓ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 26 tons/hour	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	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 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ 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
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(abaals 🔽	only one
	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 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?		□ 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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ 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	is separate	
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collected 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	□ No
	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 □ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	☐ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 11 –CCB Plant-BLOCK weigh hopper/mixer w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 01/27/09 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check 🗹 box for each	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		☐ No ☐ No
operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour		☐ No ☐ No
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 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	Yes Yes	□ 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)?	X Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	• •
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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes	☐ No
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 conducted a that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loaded during		
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? 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.	□ No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching 	rate and	□ No
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi	nutes	□ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector wh from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust c		
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? min		☐ 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?		⊠ 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. 		□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CC	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each c	
	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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		⊠ No
-	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	- ⊠ Yes · ⊠ Yes · ⊠ Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNo
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	$\frac{\text{ne/yr}}{\text{e/yr}} \le 1.00^{\circ}$?
	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		☐ No
GE.	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ c box for each q	
l t	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?	□ V ₂₂	N No
2. 1	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		⊠ No □ No
1	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?	_	□ No
3. I	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	S	□ No

ATABLE PLANT:	(sheets 7	ambu ama
	(check box for each	
e facility: stationary [3]; relocatable [3]; or consisting rete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing [3]	plants? (If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cem	nent and	
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes	☐ No
(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Depart		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one busi		☐ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than fi c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation		∐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at		☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a s	separate air construction or air operation permit.	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emiss	ions unit in that separate permit:	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-ro If YES, what was the purpose?	utine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? \(\begin{aligned} Yes \\ \equiv \end{aligned}	∐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate ho	w long it was	
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in dur	Yes	☐ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in dur	ation?	☐ No
CHANGES	(check ☑	only one
Administrative Changes:	box for each of	
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone nu	mber of the facility or authorized representative not	٠
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical r	relocation of the facility or any emissions units or	<u> </u>
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mit. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within		⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership		
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	□ v	N-
a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without repla		⊠ No ⊠ No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that	t is substantially different? Yes	⊠ No
d. A change in ownership?		⊠ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new r		
30 days prior to the change?	Yes	☐ No
Nedin Bahtic	12/12/11	•
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
Nedru Balitie	12/12/14	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	
COMMENTS: Note: All questions left unanswered do not a	nnly	

Aggregate piles appeared to be wet. Annual VE testing on EUs 010 and 011 was done on 10/11/11. Ready-mix part of plant has been inactive since August 2008.