

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)	
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 0710024 DATE: <u>12/14/11</u> ARRIVE: <u>10:15 am</u> DEPART:	12:00
FACILITY NAME: BONITA SPRINGS READY MIX PLANT	
FACILITY LOCATION: 25091 OLD US 41 S	
BONITA SPRINGS 34135-	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DAVID GUILLAUME PHONE: (770)392-530	0
Email: Mobile: CONTACT NAME: Todd W. Martin Email: twmartin@preferredmaterials.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/15/2007 / 12/15/2012 (effective date) (end date) Mobile: (239)992-140 Mobile: (239)229-698	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	IANCE
DADT H. ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	_
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes:	(check ✓ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID GUILLAUME?	⊠ Yes □No
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still WAYNE BENNER? If no, who is?: Look above	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	∑ Yes

Emissions Unit Section 1 -Cement silo compartment 1- Batching Facility No. 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{12/22/08}{(475)^2}$	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	⊠ v	□ M.
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		∐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	X Yes	☐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 12/15/10 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? 36 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?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	X Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(1 1 7	1
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check	only one
	box for each	question)
	<u></u>	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	\(\text{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. 	X Yes	☐ No
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 silo		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not I		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	Yes	☐ 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?		☐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go 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
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? m		
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector wh		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust of conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration.	on? Yes	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ No
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. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? <u>17</u> tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 4 –Single compartment flyash silo - Batching Facility No. 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/22/08	(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?	I/A Yes No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 28 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?	I/A Yes No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last If not, what was the problem (if known)?	VE test? ⊠ Yes □ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check only one 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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)?	
 d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A - s e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? 	ilo not loaded during inspection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust colle	ector? Yes No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) 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 temperature 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 colled 	ector which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batche conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	d 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?	
 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? 21 tons/hour. 	

Emissions Unit Section 9 - Cement weigh hopper - Batching Facility No. 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/22/08 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	
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 to If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Yes No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ only one 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?	🛚 Yes 🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No \(\sum \) 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'	? 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 h.
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batch 	
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	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) du conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and dur 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	ration? X 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. 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 12 –Flyash/slag silo compartment 2 - Batching Facility No. 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/22/08 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	⊠ 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 ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34</u> 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?		□ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching raduration?	te and	
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minuth. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	ites n is separate	☐ N0
	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? minut	Yes 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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? 34 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No

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.)?		⊠ 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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	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 + MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM gal	$\frac{\text{ane/yr}}{\text{e/yr}} \le 1.00$?
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?		⊠ 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?	⊠ v _{as}	□ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all		∐ No □ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	s es	☐ 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: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both star	tionary and relocatable	(check ☑ box for each	•
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If a</i>		g question 2.)	
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.)		- Yes	☐ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Lo e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day pr b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification 	ior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five but	on Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	□ No□ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in	construction or air operation per that separate permit:	mit,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpoIf 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?			☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes:			•
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the			
 associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	f the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility?	its or - Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change?	its or - Yes - Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNo
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change? tially different?	its or -	NoNoNoNo
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change?	its or -	NoNoNoNoNoNo
 associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change?	its or - Yes - Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
 associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change? tially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	its or - Yes - Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation o operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adminis 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?	f the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change? tially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	its or -	No No No No No No