

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	_	AINT/DISCOVER'	Y (CI)	
ΑI	AIRS ID#: 0510007 DATE: <u>12/21/10</u> ARRIVE: <u>10:00 a.m.</u> DEPART: <u>12:45 p.m.</u>					
FA	ACILITY NAME: REA	ADY-MIX PLANT				
FA	ACILITY LOCATION	425 E HAITI AVE				
		CLEWISTON 334	440-			
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: ONTACT NAME: Email: NTITLEMENT PERIC	D REPRESENTATIVE: DD: 1/27/2008 / 1/27/2 (effective date) (end date)	2013	PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(813)983-8144	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
	Name(s) of facility rep Brief Notes:	resentative(s):	Ī		(check ☑ box for each	•
2.	Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?:	resentative still LEROY HA	.RE?		X Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility contact st If no, who is?:	ility provide an administrati till ?	ive update within 3	0 days?	Yes Yes	□No □No
4.		eting VE test(s) during today ance authority notified at lea				□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 2 -Cement storage silo with baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection:	(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		☐ No ☐ No
operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 12/31/10	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? 29.8 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 enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(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?	- Xes	☐ No
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 5 % for the highest six-minute average. 	X Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo c 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 No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.31$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.31$ and go t		⊠ 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 a duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mir 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 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.	n? 🛛 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 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? 18.88 tons/hour.	🛚 Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 -cement weigh hopper subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/31/09 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		No No No 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
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?	X 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?	\(\times \text{ 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 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection. 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? - <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</i>		☐ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	X Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batchin duration?	X Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minute. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector with the collection of the collection.		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust	collector	□ NT.
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durat 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 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?	X 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? tons/hour. 	X Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 -New Cement Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/31/09	(check ☑ only one box for each 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	
operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 12/31/09	☐ 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? 24.1 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 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	— Yes ⊠ No ☐ Yes ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE tends of the problem (if known)?	st? 🛛 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 question)
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 <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Yes No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the si 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? 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 $g.1$) 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 batchi duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?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 duration? What was the batching duration?	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?	
 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. 	

Facility Section (continued)

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v 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)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	<u>ane/yr</u> ≤ 1.0 e/yr	0?
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?		⊠ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check only one box for each 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
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?		☐ 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:	_ h	(check 🗹 o		
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ box for each question) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary</i> , <i>skip the following question 2</i> .)				
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		☐ Yes	☐ No	
(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 Ai		□ * /		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Fo	2 2	∐ Yes	∐ No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification For		☐ Yes	☐ No	
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five busines		Yes	☐ No	
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air const		t ,		
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that s		□ 3 7	□ N.	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e If YES, what was the purpose?	, there is no repeated usage)?	∐ Yes	∐ No	
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was				
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		∐ Yes □ Yes	∐ No □ No	
ir 123, were any periods more than 6 months in duration:				
CHANGES		(check 🗹 o	only one	
Administrative Changes:	b	ox for each q	uestion)	
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility	ity or authorized representativ	e not		
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the f	facility or any emissions units	or		
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes No 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?				
			⊠ No	
New 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?			⊠ 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 submi	tted	_	
30 days prior to the change?		☐ Yes	☐ No	
Sherrill Culliver	12/21/10			
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of the Print of the	te of Inspection			
Inspector's Signature Ap	proximate Date of Next Inspe	ction		
COMMENTS: At the start of the test run, the pop off valve was leaking. The silo operated correctly.	ey re-glued the seal. After the	seal was re-	gluded the	