

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0950020 DATE: <u>5/30/13</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:55 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:10 AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: MASCHMEYER-ORLANDO FAC	ILITY	
FACILITY LOCATION: 2311 Dinneen Ave		
ORLANDO 32804-420	)3	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ROB Email: tucker@maschmeyer.com CONTACT NAME: DAX DAWSON Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/5/2009 / 10/5/2014 (effective date) (end date)	ERT TUCKER PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(561)718-0551
F	acility Section	
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS       (ch         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COMP		Γ Non-COMPLIANCE
<ul> <li>PART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u></li> <li>1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Robert D. Mastin</u> Brief Notes:</li> </ul>	<u>ie, Assistant Manager</u>	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)
<ol> <li>Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT TUCKI If no, who is?:</li> </ol>	ER?	YesNo
If different, did the facility provide an administrative up 3. Is the facility contact still DAX DAWSON? If no, who is?: <u>Stan Smith, Plant Manager</u>		
<ol> <li>Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's ins If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15</li> </ol>		

### **Emissions Unit Section**

<u>2 – CCB Plant-splitsilo,comp.#1(cement)w/individ.silotop b-house subject to 5% Opa</u>	<u>city Limit</u>	
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>11/13/2012</u></li> <li>Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:         <ul> <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> </ul> </li> </ol>	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: <u>6/6/12</u></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? <u>31.12</u> 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? X N/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	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
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% 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
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? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not load 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 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	Ves	🗌 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 rate</li> </ol>	Yes	🗌 No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>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</li> </ul>	n is separate	
<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? minute</li> </ul>	? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		□ No
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>		□ No
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No

### **Emissions Unit Section**

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1. Date of last inspection: 11/13/12         2. Det Vi ible Excitation (VE) to the	(check 🗹 box for each	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 forst year of constraint was a VE test performed within 20 days of commencing</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 6/6/12</li> </ul>	Tes Yes	D 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? <u>34.44</u> 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? X/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□ 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: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check $\square$ 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
<ul><li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li><li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li></ul>	Xes Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emission test testated in an opacity of % for the inglest six-initial average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	TYes	🗌 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? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		Dection.
<ul> <li>f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour</li> <li>g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?</li> </ul>	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
<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which</li> </ul>		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	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?tons/hour. What was the batching duration?minute</li> </ul>	es	∐ 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?		☐ No ☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% 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? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
-		

### **Emissions Unit Section**

|--|

- OOD Fluit weigh hopper w/marviadur bughouse subject to 570 Opuerty Em		
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>		
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>11/13/12</u></li> <li>Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> </ol>		
<ul><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>	⊠ Ye □ Ye	
operation? X N/A d. Date of last VE test: 6/6/12	☐ Ye	s 🗌 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> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state</li> </ul>	⊠ Ye □ Ye	=
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	☐ Ye ☐ Ye	—
<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>	🛛 Ye	s 🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment		
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xe Ye	s 🗌 No
<ul><li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li><li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li></ul>	Xe Ye	es 🗌 No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🗌 Ye	es 🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conthat 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 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 $N$	Ye	es 🗌 No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Ye Ye	s 🗌 No
<ul> <li>2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?</li></ul>	Tes Ye	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the sile dust collector, was the wighle emission test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector.		ate
<ul><li>from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector 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? minute</li></ul>	🗌 Ye	s 🗌 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?	Xe Ye Ye	=
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Ye	

# Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one	
	box for each question)	
<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>	Xes No Yes 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>		
<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>		
<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 □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ 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		
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?		

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:	(check 🗹	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary $\square$ ; relocatable $\square$ ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable $\square$	box for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the followi	ng question 2.	)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	No No
( <i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.</i> ) 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?	🗌 Yes	□ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900	(6)]	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation?		∐ No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900( 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 pe	rmit,	
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	$(a)^2 \square \mathbf{V}_{ac}$	□ 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	
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
CHANGES	(check 🗹	only one
	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes:	box for each	•
	box for each ative not	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	box for each ative not nits or Yes	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes	question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes bmitted	n question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	n question)
<ul> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes bmitted	n question)

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

5/30/2013

Date of Inspection

6/30/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The EPD's inspector Norma Ali, met with Robert D Mastine, Assistant Manager, and Kent Bottorf, consultant from Bottorf Associates, Inc to audit the facility's annual visual emission test. Thirty minutes after the tankers started loading up the silo with cement and fly ash, the inspector noticed dust coming out from the top of silo, and apparently the pop off valve malfunctioned. The test was stopped on the 21<sup>st</sup> minute, due to the fugitive emissions coming out from the pop off valve.

Also, the inspector observed a cloud of dust coming out from the load out truck area, even though the sprinklers on the spray bar were on, it was not enough to control all the dust, exceeding the fugitive emissions limit of 20 percent.

The inspector talked to Mr. Mastine and Kent Bottorf and explained the problems observed, and told them the facility has to fix them and reschedule the test. OCEPD will be sending a compliance assistance letter to the facility requesting repair records/receipts and to request a new annual compliance test for the three emission units.