

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY	(CI)
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	
AIRS ID#: 0950020 DATE: <u>12May2014</u>	ARRIVE: <u>0945</u>	DEPART: <u>1130</u>
FACILITY NAME: MASCHMEYER-ORLANDO	FACILITY	
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 2311 Dinneen Ave		
ORLANDO 32804	4-4203	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: In Email: tucker@maschmeyer.com CONTACT NAME: DAX DAWSON Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/5/2009 / 10/5/2 (effective date) (end date	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	HONE: (561)848-9112 (561)718-0551 (561)718-2696 (561)718-2696
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS  IN COMPLIANCE		Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	1	( ) . [7] ·
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Stan Smith</u>		(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Brief Notes:		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT (B If no, who is?:	OB) TUCKER?	X YesNo
If different, did the facility provide an administrative 3. Is the facility contact still DAX DAWSON?		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least	's inspection?st 15 days in advance?	

## Emissions Unit Section 2 – CCB Plant-splitsilo,comp.#1(cement)w/individ.silotop b-house subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 29July2013 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 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
	<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>	⊠ 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? 29.67 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 to		
	<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>		∐ No
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	- Yes	☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	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? ~12 minutes.	? 🛛 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	<ul><li>☐ No</li><li>☐ No</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? 29.67 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No

## Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-splitsilo,comp.#2(flyash)w/individ.silotop b-house subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 29July2013 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ box for each  ☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No 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>	⊠ 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
	<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>	⊠ 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?	led during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>24.89</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	h	
	<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>	te and	∐ No
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No
	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 collector.		
	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? ~12 minutes.	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?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	<ul><li>☐ No</li><li>☐ No</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? 24.89 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 29July2013 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
	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	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☑ No
	operation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	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? tons/hour	∑ Yes □ Yes	☐ 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? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ 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
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
	<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 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>		☐ 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 loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	led during ins Yes	pection.  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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes  h. ☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and - Yes	□ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.</li> <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 collector.</li> </ul>	n is separate	
	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? ~12 minutes.	? 🛛 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	☐ No ☐ No
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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 5 -CCB Plant-truck loadout/mixer chute, w/water-mist spray ring subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	
Date of last inspection: 29July2013     Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?  If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?  b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.  Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards  1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:  a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	following: Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
particulate matter from stock piles?  b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?  2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:  a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?  b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>

### **Facility Section (continued)**

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		. 🖂	_
			eck 🗹 o or each q	
		DOX I	or each q	[uestion)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:	$\square$	Vac	□ No
	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?			∐ No □ No
	c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		Yes	☐ No
	v 100 tons per year or more or any outer regulation and posturation		105	
2.	Does this facility include:			
	a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception	of		
	units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or	$\Box$	<b>3</b> 7	
	Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	- Ш	Yes	⊠ No
	11 1ES, what non-exempt units of activities?			
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener		<b>3</b> 7	⊠ N.
	permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	Ш	res	⊠ No
	11 1E3, what other general permit units of activities:			
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:		<b>3</b> 7	□ N.
	a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?			∐ No □ No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?			□ No
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?			□ No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?		Yes	☐ No
	gal discal/ur   gal gasoling/ur   MM SCE not gas/ur   MM gal prop	no/***	< 1.009	,
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 575,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 575,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 575,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 34 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 575,000 gal diesel/yr 1.3 MM gal d		<u>&lt; 1.00?</u>	
		•		
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum	ption	* 7	
	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	- 🛛	Yes	☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(oh	eck 🗹 (	nly one
	<del></del>		or each q	•
1	Has the assument on an area allowed the airconvention of any air mallotion control davice, or allowed		,	,
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?	П	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator:			_
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	. 🖂	Yes	☐ No
	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?	- 🛛	Ves	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access	s S	103	□ 110
	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 ☑ box for each	
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (	stationary and relocatable		1
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
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi</li> </ul>	prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ness days following a relocation? cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fiv			∐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions uni a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long in the purpose.	t in that separate permit: rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)		☐ No
co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		Yes Yes	□ No □ No
OWANGES			
CHANGES		(check 🗹	•
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administration 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions uni inistrative change at the facility?	ive not ts or Yes	question)  No No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days</li> </ol>	on of the facility or any emissions unitinistrative change at the facility? s of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No
Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:      Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	on of the facility or any emissions unitinistrative change at the facility? s of the change? ?	ive not ts or Yes Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes	No No No No No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days.</li> <li>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	on of the facility or any emissions unitinistrative change at the facility? s of the change? ?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days.</li> <li>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	on of the facility or any emissions unitinistrative change at the facility? s of the change? ?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	on of the facility or any emissions unital inistrative change at the facility?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days.</li> <li>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	on of the facility or any emissions unital inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	ive not ts or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>

**COMMENTS:** Inspector Omar Horta met with Kent Bottorf, consultant Bottorf Associates, and Stan Smith, Manager, on 12 May 2014 to audit the visible emision test on EU 002 and 003, Split Silo Baghouses, and 004, Weigh Hopper baghouse. Loading rate on EU 002, Cement, was 29.67 tons per hour. Loading rate on EU 003, Flyash, was 24.89 tons per hour, acceptable - within 10% of 25 tons per hour minimum loading rate. The observed opacity on all baghouses was zero percent.