

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	] COMPLAINT/DIS ] ARMS COMPLAI				
AIRS ID#: 0710024 DATE: <u>08/20/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:30 a.m</u>	n. DEPART: <u>11:10 a.</u>	<u>.m.</u>		
FACILITY NAME: BONITA SPRINGS READY MIX	( PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION: 25091 OLD US 41 S					
BONITA SPRINGS	34135				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:DAVID GUILLAUMEPHONE:(770)392-5300Email:Mobile:CONTACT NAME:WAYNE BENNERPHONE:(239)992-1400					
Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/15/2007 / 12/15/2 (effective date) (end date)		Mobile:			
]	Facility Section				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (c	check 🗹 only one box)				
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COM	IPLIANCE SIGN	NIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
Г /					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING         1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):			only one each question)		
Brief Notes:					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still DAVID GUILL If no, who is?:	.AUME?	Xe	s 🗌No		
If different, did the facility provide an administrative of 3. Is the facility contact still WAYNE BENNER?					

	If no, who is?:		
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Yes Yes	□No ⊠No

## **Emissions Unit Section**

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       12/01/2011	(check ☑ box for each c	only one question)
		ļ
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	<b>~</b> 7 <del>~</del> <i>•</i>	— I
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes Yes	∐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	🛛 Yes	No 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: <u>12/01/2011</u>		ļ
<ul><li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li><li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li><li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour</li></ul>	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? XN/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each c	•
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?	Xes Yes	□ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.00</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	Yes	No No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo con-	ducted at a ra	te
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\bigotimes$ 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?	∐ Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34.3</u> 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 h		🛛 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?		🗌 No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minut		
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		_
<ul><li>conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?</li><li>2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes</li></ul>		🛛 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?		□ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.00</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> </ul>	Xes	□ No
d. What was the process rate? <u>34.3</u> tons/hour.		

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	
	(check $\mathbf{\nabla}$ only one box for each question)
1. Develop for the large standard to the device the standard standard to see the	box for each question)
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:</li> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> </ol>	Xes No
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?	
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the e	
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule $62-210.300(3)$	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	Ves 🛛 No
If TES, what holi-exempt units of activities?	
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
If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	
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?	Ves No
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 No
gal diesel/yr +gal gasoline/yr +MM SCF nat. gas/yr +MM	gal propaga/yr < 1.002
275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM g	
	ar propuno ji
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fue	el consumption
for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	Yes No

GENERAL 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
<ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li></ul>		
<ul><li>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?</li><li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces</li></ul>		🗌 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:         1. Is the facility: stationary [\sqrts]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable []         concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the follow)	box for each	•
<ul> <li>2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner of operator houry the appropriate Department of Escar Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.90]</li> </ul>		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900	Yes	🗌 No
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 p and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:	ermit,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usa If YES, what was the purpose?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	only one
Administrative Changes:		question

1.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not	
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the 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? Yes	🗌 No
Ne	ew 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 submitted	
	30 days prior to the change? Yes	🗌 No

ROBERT J. STEWART

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

08-20-2012

08-2013

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** VE test on westernmost slag silo, Plant # 1, that the facility had found a pinhole leak on the upper rim of the silo. and repaired with a patch (See attached photos). VE test conducted with consultant Beatty Environmental Services and noted no problems or leakage from the patch.