

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>		ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA	AINT NO:		
ΑI	RS ID#: 0950012 DAT	TE: <u>5/3/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>09:35</u>	DEPAR	T: <u>11:45</u>	
FA	ACILITY NAME: WIN	ITER GARDEN				
FA	CILITY LOCATION:	201 HENNIS RD				
		WINTER GARDEN	32787			
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZED Email: DNTACT NAME: Email: VTITLEMENT PERIO	D: 12/12/2007 / 12/12 (effective date) (end date	2/2012	PHONE: (813)933-0 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	5711	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
		oductory MEETING esentative(s): Denise Corra	<u>les</u>		(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Represent If no, who is?:	esentative still DENISE COF	RRALES?		⊠ Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility contact still fino, who is?:	lity provide an administrativ ill?	re update within 30 days?			□No □No
4.		ing VE test(s) during today'nce authority notified at leas				□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –Slag Silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
1. Data (last 's as a' see 9/11/2010	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 8/11/2010 2. Part Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	X Yes	□ No
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
	<u> 1es</u>	M N0
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 2/7/2008	✓ v	□ N-
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?		∐ No □ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 27.06 tons/hour	M 168	
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	☐ Yes	□ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ No
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	? X Yes	□No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	2 105	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	X Yes	□ No
·		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	✓ v	□ Na
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	\(\text{Yes}	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the sil	o conducted at a 1	rate
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?		□ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 30.7 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 g		
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 batchin		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 30 minu		
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector w		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust		□ No
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? 30 minut		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate?tons/notif. What was the batching duration? <u>50</u> inhiticed. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted by the hispector for this third during this site visit:		
b. The visible emission test conducted according to Er A Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0% for the highest six-minute average.	- 🖂 1Cs	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 30.7 tons/hour.	<u> </u>	
to the process rate.		

Emissions Unit Section 4 –Truck Loadout subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
	Date of last inspection: $\underline{3/9/2010}$	box for each	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	∐ 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: 3/9/2010	☐ 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	∑ 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
DA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		
FA	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?	⊠ 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>0.0</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 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? 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?	☐ 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?		☐ 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? <u>9.5</u> minutes		
	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? <u>9.5</u> minutes.	! ⊠ Yes	∐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	No 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>0.0</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? tons/hour.		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check	only one
		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 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.)? 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 gene 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)?	-	 No No No No No No No
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagator 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagator 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?	ne/yr)? □ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	
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? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- X Yes	☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

	RELOCATABLE PLANT: (check ☑ only one				
	Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing pla		box for each g question 2.	* ′	
(I	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cemer soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	low.)	- Yes	☐ No	
	a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Departm e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one busineb. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation	ss day prior to changing location?	Yes	☐ No	
	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation N	business days following a relocation?	Yes	☐ No	
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at lea	ast five business days prior to relocation? -	Yes	☐ No	
	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a sepand the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emission		nit,		
	a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routing If YES, what was the purpose?)?	☐ No	
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how co-located at the permitted facility?		- TYes	□ No	
	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in durati	ion?	- Yes	☐ No	
<u>CH</u>	IANGES		(check v box for each	only one	
	ministrative Changes:			ii question)	
	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone num				
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical rel				
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical rel operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mino	ocation of the facility or any emissions un radministrative change at the facility?	its or - Yes	⊠ No	
2.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30	ocation of the facility or any emissions un radministrative change at the facility?	its or - Yes	⊠ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u>	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	ocation of the facility or any emissions un radministrative change at the facility?	its or - Yes	=	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mino If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change?	its or - Yes - Yes - Yes	□ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor of YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replace	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? days of the change?	its or -	□ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor of YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replace c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that it	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? days of the change?ement?s substantially different?	its or	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor of YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replace	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? days of the change?ement?s substantially different?	its or	□ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor of YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replace c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that it	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change? ement?	rits or Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNo	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mino If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change? ement?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mino If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change? ement?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor of YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
2. <u>Nev</u> 3.	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mino If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	ocation of the facility or any emissions un administrative change at the facility? 0 days of the change?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam from Orange County met Mr.Noah Handley from Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., at Preferred Materials at 201 Hennis Road, Winter Garden Florida. Two VES were conducted on this date which are on slag silo(EU003) and loadout(EU004). All the loading rates were with acceptable and observed opacity was zero percent for both emission units. Most of the roads were dry, no dust or PM was leaving the property. No water truck was observed operating during the inspection.