

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:							
AIRS ID#: 0950071 DATE: <u>1/21/2011</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:00 AM</u> DEPART:	10:00 AM						
FACILITY NAME: TAFT PLANT							
FACILITY LOCATION: 131 E LANDSTREET RD							
ORLANDO 32824-7824							
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: KATHIE CHUMLEY Email: CONTACT NAME: WALTER CRABTREE Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 11/1/2010 / 11/1/2015 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (904)380-013 Mobile: PHONE: (407)466-148 Mobile:							
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): Kenneth Ruehlen Brief Notes: Area Manager for Central Florida Division	(check d only one box for each question)						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still KATHIE CHUMLEY?	⊠ Yes □No						
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still WALTER CRABTREE?	☐ Yes ☐No ☑ Yes ☐No						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?							

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-2silos(1Ecement,1W/slag)&batcherw/central baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 1/12/2010 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?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No		
	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 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✓ Yes✓ Yes	□ 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.	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? \(\bigvee Yes \mathbb{N} \) No \(\bigvee N/A - \text{silo not loaded during inspection.} \)				
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 29.57 tons/hour	Yes	∐ 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	Xes	☐ No		
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No		
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No		
	 3) What was the batching rate? 160#/sec tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 10 minut 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. 	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? minut		☐ 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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No		
	 c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 28.49 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No		

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
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?	X Yes			
2. Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the e units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3 Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	3) or			
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other 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?				
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)?				
$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$				
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fue for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	el consumption 			
GENERAL CONDITIONS				
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or al the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices?	rol			
Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?				
b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies w terms and conditions of the air general permit?				
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Departme to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air permit and Department rules?	r general			

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	•		
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (box for each ag question 2.)	question)		
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		
 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 Notifi 	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	ess days following a relocation? ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	Yes	□ No		
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate			∐ No		
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?	in that separate permit:		☐ No		
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long i co-located at the permitted facility?			□ No		
Ti 125, Here any periode more anni e menane mi denane.					
<u>CHANGES</u> (check ☑ only one					
		box for each	•		
 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 administrative Changes: 	n of the facility or any emissions ur	nits or	⊠ No		
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:			☐ No		
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		_	☐ N0		
a. Installation of any new process equipment?			□ No		
a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subset. A change in ownership?	? tantially different?				
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substituted. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration. 	?stantially different?on form and the appropriate fee sul	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo		
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substituted. A change in ownership?	?stantially different?on form and the appropriate fee sul		NoNoNoNo		
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	?stantially different?on form and the appropriate fee sul	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo		
 b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substituted. A change in ownership?	?stantially different? on form and the appropriate fee sul	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo		
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substituted. A change in ownership?	?stantially different?on form and the appropriate fee sul	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNo		

COMMENTS: OCEPD personnel, Bill Rhodes, arrived at the plant at approximately 8:00 AM to audit a VE test on the central dust collector (EU-001). Sara Greivell, the consultant, representing Grove Scientific & Engineering, was also present, as well as Mr. Kenneth Ruehlen, Area Manager for the Central Florida Division of Florida Rock Industries, Inc. The plant manager, Mr. Walter Crabtree, was out for the day. The central dust collector at this facility controls the emissions for the two silos (cement & slag), as well as the batching operation. The truck arrived at the facility at approximately 8:00 AM, containing slag to be off-loaded. A 30-minute VE was performed with 0% opacity observed. One truck was observed batching (10-minutes) during the VE test, resulting in a rate of 160 lbs/sec., with 0% opacity observed. The truck pumping rate was approximately 10-12 psi, resulting in a loading rate of 28.49 TPH, which is acceptable. The facility stores diesel fuel in a 10K AST for the ready-mix trucks. According to Mr. Ruehlen,

usage is approximately 7K bi-monthly. It should be noted that rain occurred during the entire test, therefore the facility/internal roads were wet with no dust observed leaving the property.