CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	NT/DISCOVERY (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0150015 DATE: <u>8/17/11</u> ARRIVE:	DEPART:
FACILITY NAME: FLORIDA ROCK INDUSTRIES	
FACILITY LOCATION: 580 PRINEVILLE ST	
PORT CHARLOTTE 33624	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: HUGH PERRY Email: CONTACT NAME: CHRIS WENKE Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/16/2006 / 12/16/2011 (effective date) (end date)	PHONE: (904)355-1781 Mobile: PHONE: (941)625-1244 Mobile:
Facility Section	n
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u> <u>STATUS</u> (check d only one	e box)
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):	(check download only one box for each question)
Brief Notes:	
2 Is the Authorized Representative still HUGH PERRY?	X Yes No

2.	Is the Authorized Representative still HUGH PERRY? If no, who is?:	Yes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still CHRIS WENKE? If no, who is?:	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No

	-Loadout Dust Collector	(Ground Mounted) sub	oject to 5% Opacity Limit
--	-------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

1-Loadout Dust Collector (Ground Mounted) subject to 5% Opacity Limit	it	
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 8/12/10 2. Dast Visible Emissions (VE) tests	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 2. 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 	\boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes	□ No □ No
 d. Date of last VE test: <u>8/12/10</u> N/A 	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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. 	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>o</u> /o for the inglicit six initiate average. i. 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? \Box Yes \boxtimes No \Box N/A – silo not loa e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.
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 go to	\bowtie_{h} 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? minute	🛛 Yes utes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the sile dust collector was the visible emissions text of the weigh hommon (batcher) dust collector.		
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 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 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. 		

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 8/12/10 2. Description: 8/12/10	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 2. 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 constraint was a VE test performed within 20 days of commencing. 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 8/12/10 	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? <u>28.68</u> 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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes 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?	Xes 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 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? 	Ves	🖾 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?	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 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	🗌 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 <u>0</u> % 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? <u>30.7</u> tons/hour. 	Xes Yes	🗌 No

4 –West split Silo	(North Side) Dust	Collector subject to 5%	Opacity Limit

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1.	Date of last inspection: $\frac{8/12}{10}$	box for each	
	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	\boxtimes Yes	No No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	🛛 Yes	∐ No
	 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 8/12/10 	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? <u>39.8</u> 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
PA	RT II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹	only one
	enciosed 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?	X 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.
	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 go to	\square 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 rate duration?	- 🗌 Yes	D No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minute. 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 coll	lector	
	 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration⁴ 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut 		🗌 No
	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	🛛 Yes	No No
	a. Was the visible emission test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	∐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % 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? <u>27.7</u> tons/hour.		

<u>5 –West split Silo</u>	(South Side) Dust	Collector subject to 59	<u>% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 8/12/10 2. Description: 8/12/10	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
 2. 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
 d. Date of last VE test: 8/12/10 N/A 	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? <u>26.87</u> 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 	YesYes	⊠ 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)? 	Xes 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	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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	Yes Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the inglest six-initiate average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contract $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n}$		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load 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
 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 		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust colle 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	🗌 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? <u>30.7</u> tons/hour.	Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GE	NERAL PERMIT ELI	GIBILITY	(ah a ah 🔽	
			(check 🗹 box for each	
			box for each	question
· · ·		s not have the potential to emit:		
		ollutant?		No No
		hazardous air pollutants? l air pollutant?		🛛 No 🕅 No
c 100 tons per year or mo	re of any other regulated	i air poilutant?		
2. Does this facility include:				
		the applicable air general permit (with the exc	ception of	
		ig pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3)	1	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? -			Yes	🖂 No
If YES, what non-ex	xempt units or activities?	?		
		another air general permit where such other at	e	
	general permit units or a	the use of one another at the same facility?	Yes	🛛 No
If TES, what other	general permit units of ac			
3. Is the total combined ann	ual facility-wide fuel usa	age of all plants less than or equal to:		
a. 275,000 gallons of dies	sel fuel?		Yes	🛛 No
				🛛 No
				🛛 No
				No No
e. Or an equivalent prorat	ed amount if multiple fu	els are used onsite (use equation below)?	Yes	🛛 No
gal diesel/yr +	al asoline/yr +	MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM ga	$a_1 \text{propage}/\text{yr} < 1.00$	19
$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yl}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} = \frac{1}{275}$		44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + 1.3 MM gal		•
2, 5,000 gui diesen/ yi 20	,,000 Sui Susoinio, yi		propune, yr	
4. Has the owner/operator n	naintained, available for i	inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel	consumption	
for each consecutive 12-p	period for the past 5 years	s?	Yes	🖂 No
-				

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for each	only one net only one
1. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allow the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control	_	
devices? 2. Does the owner or operator:	Ves	🛛 No
 a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with 		🛛 No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	🛛 No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air ger permit and Department rules?	neral	🛛 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [X]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable [] concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following plants)	(check 🗹 box for each (ng question 2.)	•
 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?		🗌 No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900 to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?		🗌 No
 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per 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 co-located at the permitted facility?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ 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? 	nits or	🖂 No

2.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	Yes	🛛 No
Ne	w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		
3.	Since the last registration form submittal 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 with equipment that is substantially different?	Yes	🛛 No
	d. A change in ownership?	Yes	🛛 No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submit	itted	
	30 days prior to the change?	Yes	🛛 No

Sherrill Culliver

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

8/17/11

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The slag silo wasn't tested. By description of EU 4 is East silo and East baghouse.