

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DIS	SCOVERY (CI) INT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 0710030 DATE: <u>1/24/12</u> ARRIVE: <u>1:30 pm</u>	DEPART: 3 pm					
FACILITY NAME: CONCRETE PIPE-FORT MYERS						
FACILITY LOCATION: 2040 ORTIZ AVE						
FORT MYERS 33905-3721						
Email: CONTACT NAME: DAVE MEDINA	PHONE: (239)332-0135 Mobile: PHONE: (239)332-0135 Mobile:					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
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 DAVE MEDINA?						
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? - 3. Is the facility contact still DAVE MEDINA? If no, who is?:						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) North, w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one	
1. Data of last in a still a 2/16/11	box for each		
1. Date of last inspection: 2/16/11 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	
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		□ No	
	- M les	□ 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: 2/16/11 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? 		☐ No	
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 33 tons/hour	X Yes	∐ 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	☐ Yes	⊠ No	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	- Yes	☐ 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	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	/ 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1	1	
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?	- 🛚 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	_	_	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	☐ No	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?			
d. Dywing visible emissions tests of the sile dust collector exhaust maintagues the leading of the sile	andusted at a m	oto	
	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 inspection.		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No	
f. What was the silo loading rate?tons/hour	<u> </u>		
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 t	o h.	_	
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 a		☐ No	
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min		□ No	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi			
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	n? 🗌 Yes	☐ No	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu			
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?	- X Yes	∐ No	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	₩	□ N-	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate?tons/hour.	X Yes	☐ No	
d. what was the process rate:tons/nour.			

Emissions Unit Section 2 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash) South, w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
1. D. Cl	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: 2/16/11	1
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	✓ v □ v.
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? No. 1 December 1977 to the 2016 (11)	/A Yes No
 d. Date of last VE test: 2/16/11 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the tenth of the compliance authority of later than 45 days after the tenth of the compliance authority of later than 45 days after the tenth of the compliance authority of later than 45 days after the tenth of the compliance authority of later than 45 days after the tenth of the compliance authority of later than 45 days after the tenth of later than 45 days after the later than 45 days	est? X Yes No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 28 tons/hour	to
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. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes 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 V	'E test? ⊠ Yes □ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
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
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 % for the highest six-minute ave	rage
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	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 t	the silo conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \square Yes \square No \square N/A - sil	
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 collect	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$)	
 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 batching rate. 	
duration?	
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 collection	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher	
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?	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 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 3% 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)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
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 gener 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	<u>nne/yr</u> < 1.00° e/yr	?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ption Yes	⊠ No
CI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check b ox for each contact the contact	
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?		No 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? ————————————————————————————————————		⊠ No
	permit and Department rules?	- Yes	⊠ No

	ELOCATABLE PLANT: Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the followin</i>	(check 🗹 box for each g question 2.)	question)
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	- Yes	⊠ No
	 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900] 		□ 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(6	- 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 per and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage If 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
~			
	HANGES	(check ☑ box for each	
 2. 	Iministrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representate associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions undependent on the properties of the facility or any emissions undependent on the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	its or - 🔲 Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
3.	Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?		NoNoNoNoNoNo
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change?	mitted Yes	⊠ No
Sh	errill Culliver 1/26/12		
	Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection	

COMMENTS: Emission Unit 2 emitted dust due to the filling of the silo. The silo was filled then the pop off valve was engaged. The tanker driver turn off his tanker. Visible emissions were observed at a 3% opacity. Later discovered the silo do not have an indicator light or system for when the silo is full.