

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 0210026 DATE: 7/19/11 ARRIVE: 9:30 a.m. DEPART: 11:00 a.m.					
FACILITY NAME: EAST TRAIL R/M FACILITY					
FACILITY LOCATION: 15555 US 41					
NAPLES 33940					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JASON JONES Email: jasonp.jones@cemex.com CONTACT NAME: JASON JONES Email: jasonp.jones@cemex.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/12/2013 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (813)269-124 Mobile: (813)363-611	2				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	IANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(11.17/1				
Name(s) of facility representative(s):	(check ✓ only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes:					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still JASON JONES?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still JASON JONES? If no, who is?:	 ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ Yes ∑ No 				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	☐ Yes☐No☐ Yes☐No				

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) Plant #2 w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 7/29/10 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	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 test? If not, what was the problem (if known)?		□ No
PA	RT 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 contact 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?	ded during ins	
	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?	- Yes	☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	n is separate ector	
	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		☐ 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 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? tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 7/29/10 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 operation?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No
PA	ART 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 <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. 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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	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 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? minuth. 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. 	n is separate ector	
	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		⊠ 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ 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 4 –CCB Plant-splitsilo(cement)Plant#2ANorth compart#1w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

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? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.	│ No │ No
enclosed storage and conveying equipment box for each que 1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? 🗵 Yes	aly one estion)
	No
to the visible education leaf recibled in an objectivity of the bitinear attending average] No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes If not, what was the problem (if known)?] 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 inspec	tion
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? 🛛 Yes	No
	No 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 h. 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 and] 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 is separate	_
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector	7 No.
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? Yes 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.	□ 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	ا
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 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? tons/hour. 	No No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(ch	eck 🗹 o	nly one
			or each q	
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 Yes Yes	No 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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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	No No No No No No No No No
	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	<u>nne/yr</u> e/yr	≤ 1.00?	
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?		Yes	⊠ No
<u>GI</u>	ENERAL CONDITIONS		eck 🗹 o or each q	
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?	. 🗇 ,	Yes	⊠ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all			
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- □ ` s	Yes	⊠ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	🔲 ,	Yes	⊠ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both station concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only</i>	ary and relocatable
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.)	
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior t b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification 	to changing location? Yes No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business day c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification F	ys following a relocation? Yes No Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five busin 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air con	nstruction or air operation permit,
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in tha a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (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?	Yes No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
 Administrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fac associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrat If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been 	cility or authorized representative not e facility or any emissions units or tive change at the facility? Yes No
a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantial d. A change in ownership?	Yes No ly different? Yes No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration for 30 days prior to the change?	m and the appropriate fee submitted Yes No
Sherrill Culliver	7/19/11
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
Inspector's Signature A	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
COMMENTS: The weight hopper baghouse (EU #6) for the northern plant	t has an emission problem. At the start of the batching

COMMENTS: The weight hopper baghouse (EU #6) for the northern plant has an emission problem. At the start of the batching loading cycle, visible emissions are observed for the first thirty seconds, then the emissions intermittence after that. Since the batching process is only 6 to 8 minutes long and the visible emission show up infrequently, an emission violation of the 5% opacity standard is not possible.

Since visible emissions are occurring, then circumvention of a pollution device is possible violation. I will draft a non-compliance letter to Jason Jones to resolve the matter.