

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)  ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 0950024 DATE: <u>7/25/2013</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:35</u> DEPART:	11:00				
FACILITY NAME: FLORIDA ROCK/CARDER ROAD PLANT					
FACILITY LOCATION: 5109 CARDER RD					
ORLANDO 32810-5111					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: LORI SANVILLE Email: CONTACT NAME: KATHERINE CHUMLEY Email: chumleyk@vmcmail.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/18/2013 / 4/18/2018 (effective date) (end date)  PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: (904)380-013 Mobile:	30				
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 1 <b>[7</b> ]				
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Katherine Chumley</u>	(check <b>☑</b> only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes:  2. Is the Authorized Representative still LORI SANVILLE?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still KATHERINE CHUMLEY?  If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	- ⊠ Yes □No ⊠ Yes □No				

## Emissions Unit Section 1 -Block Plant Cement Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO I	NSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. Data of last in a series 7/12/2012		box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 7/12/2012			,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	ch of the past 4 calendar years?	X Yes	□ No
	ithin the current calendar year?		∐ No ⊠ No
<u> </u>	•	- les	⊠ No
operation?	test performed within 30 days of commencing N/A	Yes	☐ No
	e compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?ading rate during emissions testing?		☐ No ☐ No
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions whether or not batching occurred d i. Did the test report state the actual ba	s controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state luring emissions testing?   N/A  stching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate If not, what was the problem (if kno	compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	🛚 Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a	a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
	sed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
		box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conduc	ted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	□ No
		<del></del>	
a. Was the visible emissions test cond	ucted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	∐ No
	n an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.  onstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?known)?	X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of th	e silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo	conducted at a r	ate
	nal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not lo		
	ading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		☐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 29.8	<u>8</u> tons/hour		
	per (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		⊠ No
	(g.1) - g.3) below. If answer NO, then skip $(g.1) - g.3$ ) and go $(g.1) - g.3$ ) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	st, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching		□ N.
	tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi		☐ No
	opper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
	the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate	te that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	n? Yes	☐ No
	ed by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test cond	lucted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ No
	n an opacity of $0.0$ % for the highest six-minute average.	<u> </u>	
c. Did the visible emissions test demo d. What was the process rate? 29.26	onstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?tons/hour.	X Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 2 - Cement Silo w/ Baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 4/18/2013 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 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?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No No No 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.	<ul> <li>Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?</li></ul>	Yes  Inducted at a reded during instance.  Yes  Yes  Yes  H.  Yes  te and  Yes  tes  it is separate ector	
2.	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut  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 <u>0.0</u> % 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? <u>31.59</u> tons/hour.	es.  Yes  Yes  Yes	No No No

## **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each of	
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 ☐ 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 general 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	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propane/yr < 1.00?  275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane/yr		?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption - X Yes	☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each of	
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
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		□ 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?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both		
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (a)  2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ( <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		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	prior to changing location? Yes No cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:		
<ul> <li>a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose?</li> <li>b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it</li> </ul>	pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)?  Yes No	
co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes No	
CHANGES  Administrative Changes:	(check $\square$ only one box for each 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		
New 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?		
d. A change in ownership?	Yes No	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrati 30 days prior to the change?		
Assefa Hailemariam	7/25/2013	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	Dute of inspection	
	~12/31/2014	

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam from Orange County EPD met Kathie Chumley and James Burkholder from Florida Rock Company, at the concrete batch and block plant at 5109 Carder Road, Orlando Florida. One split siloVE (EU002) and block silo(EU002) were conducted on this date. All the loading rates were acceptable the cement silo (EU002) 31.59tons/hr and block silo(EU001) 29.26 tons/hr. Observed opacity was zero percent for all emission units. No uncontrolled emissions and no objectionable odors were noticed.