	NUMERTAL PROTEC	TION	ic.
BI GHI	V	A rea	
FI	ORIDA	ar	1
			-

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	_	INT/DISCOVERY OMPLAINT NO:	((CI)
AIRS ID#: 1050270 DA	TE: <u>03/21/2011</u>	ARRIVE: 9	<u>):00</u>	DEPART: <u>9:40</u>
FACILITY NAME: AU	JBURNDALE PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 1371 42nd Street			
	WINTER HAVEN	33880-		
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: CONTACT NAME: M Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC		012	Mobile:	(904)355-1781 (800)741-1016
Facility Section				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)				
IN COMPLIAN	CE MINOR Non-CO	MPLIANCE [] SIGNIFICANT	Non-COMPLIANCE
L				
1. Name(s) of facility rep	RODUCTORY MEETING presentative(s): <u>Jeff, Clark Va</u>			(check \square only one box for each question)
Brief Notes: Inspecte	d facility with Jeff			

2.	Is the Authorized Representative still HUGH PERRY?	Yes	🖾No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still MATT WALL?		□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

Emissions Unit Section

	1-viivee indaly commany model vii-120331 bachoose subject to 5 /0 of		
PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		only one
1.	Date of last inspection: 06/07/2007	box for each o	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	_	
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	No No
	b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	🛛 No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? X/A	T Yes	No No
	d. Date of last VE test: 03/01/2010		
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Yes	🗌 No
l	f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		🗌 No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>30</u> tons/hour		
l	h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state $\nabla N(A)$	V.	
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes 🗌 Yes	∐ No ⊠ No
l	j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		
l	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	Xes	🗌 No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		_
D	ADT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a sila waigh hannar(hatchar) ar athar		
r P	ART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment		only one
	chelosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each o	question)
_		<u> </u>	
1.	. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	🛛 Yes	No 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% for the highest six-minute average.	<u> </u>	—
I	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes	□ No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co	nducted at a ra	ite
	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?	Yes	∐ 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? 	Xes 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 No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra	te and	_
	duration?		No No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		
	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		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?		No No
	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute		
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	🛛 No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	No No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.		
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		□ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one
	box for each question)
	box for each 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?	Yes No
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exce	eption of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) o	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air	
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?	Yes No
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?	Yes No
b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?	
c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?	
e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	Ves No
set disset/and set see line (and set on the NOA SCE set see (and the NOA set	
<u>gal diesel/yr</u> + <u>gal gasoline/yr</u> + <u>MM SCF nat. gas/yr</u> + <u>MM gal</u> 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal g	
275,000 gai diesel/yr $25,000$ gai gasonne/yr 44 whvi set nat. gas/yr 1.5 whvi gai p	nopane/ yi
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel co	onsumption
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
2. 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 with all	_	
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		🗌 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:	4h - 44 4i - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 1	(check 🗹 box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of be concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants		ing question 2.)
 Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement an soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	······	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business of b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Not 	lay prior to changing location?		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five bu c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Noti	siness days following a relocation? - fication Form [DEP No. 62-210.900	Yes (6)]	No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least a3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separa			L No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions u a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine If YES, what was the purpose?	unit in that separate permit:		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how lon co-located at the permitted facility?	-	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration	?	Yes	🗌 No
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number	of the facility or authorized represen		question)
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloca			
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor ad			No No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 da New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	ays of the change?	Yes	L No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been			
a. Installation of any new process equipment?		Yes	No No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacementc. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is so			🛛 No 🖾 No
d. A change in ownership?		Yes	\bowtie No
 If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registr 30 days prior to the change? 	ration form and the appropriate fee su	ıbmitted 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
Steven Sherman			
	03/21/2011		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	03/21/2011 Date of Inspection		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)			

COMMENTS: I, Steven Sherman, arrived at the facility at approximately 9:00 for a VE test audit and walkthrough inspection. Upon arrival, I checked in at the office and spoke with Jeff. Jeff notified me that the cement truck was running about an hour and a half late for the VE test. Jeff then gave me a walkthrough of the facility. The facility consists of a slag silo, a split silo with cement and fly ash, a weigh hopper and a truck load out, which all vent through a central dust collector. There are two stock piles of gravel that can be added in the concrete process. Both of the stock piles had sprinkler systems that were in operation during the inspection. There was a bathcing operation in process during the inspection. Kevett Mickle of Grove Scientific took a VE reading of the central dust collector during the batching and truck loadout. At approximately 9:35 Kevett Mickle left the facility and would come back for the cement silo loading VE test. I left the facility at approximately 9:40 and did not witness the cement silo loading.