

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)						
AIRS ID#: 0950036 DATE: <u>8/28/12</u>	ARRIVE: 9:50 AM	DEPART: <u>10:50 AM</u>						
FACILITY NAME: WINTER PARK READY-MIX & BLOCK PLANT								
FACILITY LOCATION: 4010 FORSYTH RD								
WINTER PARK 32792	2-6803							
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SIGUEmail: CONTACT NAME: SIGURD BO* Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/12/201 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(407)841-8409 (407)312-7119 (407)841-8409 (407)312-7119						
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): Sigurd Bo Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD BO*? If no, who is?:								
If different, did the facility provide an administrative up 3. Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO*? If no, who is?:	odate within 30 days?							
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's ins If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15								

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-R-Mix, silo #2 (cement) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 1/26/12 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		
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No		
	 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? ∑ Yes ∑ No 				
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 34.03 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.			
	 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 		∐ 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	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? minut	? 🛛 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?		□ No□ No		
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? 34.77 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(ch	ack 🔽	only one
				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?	\boxtimes	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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	 No No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 30,000 g	ane/yr ie/yr	≤ 1.00	?
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 - 🔲	Yes	⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one question)
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?	- 🖂	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?	- 🖂		☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces 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	•		
Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square box for each question) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i>)				
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes	☐ No		
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(to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation?	(6)]	□ No□ No		
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6 to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	6)]	□ 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)		☐ 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?		□ No		
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	□ No		
CHANGES	(check ☑			
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 us operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	nits or	Question) No No No No No No No		
Norma Ali 8/28/12				
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection				
12/31/13				
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next In	spection			
COMMENTS: The inspector, Norma Ali met with Sig Bo, Environmental Manager - North Florida Ma visual emission test on EU004, this unit was drained and taken out of service in 2008, the silo was to be Bo, due to the poor economy and the limited availability of capital funds, this silo has never been replace and laying on the ground. The plan is to replace this silo as capital funds become available. Until that ti current silo back into service	replaced. Acc ed. The new si	ording to Mr. lo is on site		

EU004 Cement loading 26.66 tons, loading rate of = 34.77tph Opacity observed = 0 %

The block plant has not operated during the year, due to slow economy. Yard is paved, swept and partially wet. No objectionable odors noted. The facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.