	NUMERTAL PROTEC	TION	ic.
BI GHI	V	<b>A</b> rea	
FI	ORIDA	ar	1
			-

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0950020 DAT		ARRIVE: <u>9:00 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>9:55 AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: MAS	SCHMEYER-ORLANDO FACI 2311 DINNEEN AVE ORLANDO 32804-4203		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED Email: CONTACT NAME: DA Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIO		ERT TUCKER PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(561)718-0551
	Fa	acility Section	

$\mathbf{I} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{I}, \ \underline{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{N}$	II LIANCE STATUS (CHECK EI OHI)	y one box)
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Dax Dawson, Plant Operator</u> Brief Notes:		•
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT TUCKER?	Xes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still DAX DAWSON? If no, who is?:		□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

## **Emissions Unit Section**

4 – CCB Plant-weigh hopper w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity	Limit
--	-------

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1. Date of last inspection: 1/29/10         2. Device the production of the pro	(check 🗹 box for each d	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing</li> </ul>	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 1/29/10</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<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?  N/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	D No No
<ul> <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		
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each o	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 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</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 Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contract $\nabla A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=$		
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?f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		No
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 a		No No
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat</li> </ol>	e and	∐ No
<ul> <li>duration?</li></ul>	tes	🗌 No
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust colle	ector	
<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? <u>68</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>30</u> minutes.</li></ul>	🛛 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?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? <u>68</u> tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	🗌 No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	- 🛛 Yes - 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🔀 No
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		0?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consume for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 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
<ol> <li>Does the owner or operator:</li> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> </ol>	_	No No
<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:	(check 🗹	
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		1
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>	) Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif</li> </ul>	y prior to changing location? Yes ication Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	D No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busi c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	∐ No □ No
<ol> <li>If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu</li> </ol>	it in that separate permit:	□ No
If YES, what was the purpose? 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	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number o	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not	•
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number or associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ul>	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ninistrative change at the facility?  Yes	•
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ul>	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes rs of the change? Yes t? Yes t? Yes yes	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adresting 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>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 sub d. A change in ownership?</li></ul>	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes rs of the change? Yes t? Yes t? Yes to stantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>:</li> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?</li></ul>	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes rs of the change? Yes t? Yes t? Yes to stantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adresting 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>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 sub d. A change in ownership?</li></ul>	box for each f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes rs of the change? Yes t? Yes t? Yes to stantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	question)

12/31/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** The inspector Norma Ali met with Kent Bottorf, consultant from Bottorf Associates to audit the compliance test on EU004 Weigh hopper. Opacity Observed = 0%. The inspector noticed particulate matter coming from the truck loading process and leaving the property, the opacity was below 20%, this is below the limit for fugitive emissions. Ms Ali mentioned to the consultant and plant operator, and suggested to have the spray bar ring checked in case it was clogged or maybe check into the possibility of adding a shroud around the truck loading area, since there is the potential of higher dust opacity leaving the property.

The yard is paved, back of the property was wet. No objectionable odors or PM above the 20 percent limit was observed leaving the property. The facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.