

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>INSPECTION</u> <u>TYPE</u> : ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISC	OVERY (CI)		
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAIN	T NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0111013 DATE: 4/16/2012	AIRS ID#: 0111013 DATE: 4/16/2012 ARRIVE: 930 DEPART: 1030			
FACILITY NAME: MODERN CONCRETE PROI	DUCTS			
FACILITY LOCATION: 5512 NW 10TH TE	ERR			
FORT LAUDERDA	ALE 33309-2810			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: DACraft@modernconcretepros.com CONTACT NAME: ROBERT FEAGIN Email: RFeagin@modernconcretepros.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/10/2011 / 9/10/ (effective date) (end da	Мо РН Мо 2016	HONE: (954)776-4361 obile: HONE: (954)281-0860 obile:		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
DAREN ONGRE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	n			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	_	,	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>David Craft</u>	_			
Brief Notes: Facility will be changing ownership		_		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID CR If no, who is?:	AFT?	X Yes	□No	
If different, did the facility provide an administrat 3. Is the facility contact still ROBERT FEAGIN? If no, who is?:			⊠No □No	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			⊠No ⊠No	

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-SE silo (flyash) w/individual baghouse, 70T subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: 01/31/2011 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes A	 No 	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
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?		⊠ 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?		☐ 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? \square Yes \square No \square N/A – silo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		nspection. No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour			
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collect <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) a		☐ No	
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 ba	_	☐ No	
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?		□ N0	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collect			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and a 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	duration? Yes	☐ No	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 aver		⊠ No	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		☐ No	
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.			

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-NW silo (cement) w/individual baghouse, 82T subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
Date of last inspection: 01/31/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 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?		□ No □ No	
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	Yes		
d. Date of last VE test: 11/3/2012 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 k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE te		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	140		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
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?		⊠ 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?		☐ 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 no e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		spection. 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? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and		☐ No	
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 duration?	Yes	☐ No	
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 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durt 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? rate in the property of the normal batching rate and durt of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching rate and durt of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durt of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durt of the weigh hopper (batcher) during the part of the weigh hopper (batcher) during the part of the weigh hopper (batcher) during the weigh hopper (batcher) during the part of the weigh hopper (batcher) during the part of the weigh hopper (batcher) during the weigh hopper (ation? 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 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.		☐ No	

Emissions Unit Section 5 -CCB Plant-weigh hopper/batcher w/ central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 1/31/2012	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 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? 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)?	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?	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 contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loading rate?		
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		☐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g.1) - g.3$) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> $g.1) - g.3$) <i>and go to</i>	Yes	☐ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ No
duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? min	- Yes	☐ No
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 collector.	h is separate	
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? minutering the properties of the normal batching rate and duration.	? 🗌 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)

<u>C</u> (ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each	
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?	☐ Yes	☐ 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? 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)? gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation for the propagation of the p	Yes	☐ No
4.	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?	nption	□ No
Gl	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
	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?	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No
3.	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?	- Yes	☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ 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	question)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	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] 		☐ 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(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 pe 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 usag 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?		☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u 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?	nits 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?		No No No No No No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee su 30 days prior to the change?	bmitted Yes	☐ No
Elizabeth F.Susky 3/16/2012		
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
3/16/2013		
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next In	spection	

COMMENTS: In a compliance inspection conducted on 3/16/2012, AQD staff observed operations at Modern Concrete. Mr. Robert Feagin was on-site during the inspection. The houskeeping was good and the facility has heavy roped tarping around the truck load out area. Mr. Feagin informed AQD staff that they facility would be changing ownership (the new owners had applied for a new permit). VE testing will be conducted on 4/5/2012.