

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	(CI)
AIRS ID#: 7775011 DATE: 12/22/10 ARRIVE: 8:00 a.m.	DEPART: <u>9: 45 a.m.</u>
FACILITY NAME: ALICO RD RM FACILITY	
FACILITY LOCATION: 15200 ALICO RD	
FT MYERS 33913	
Email: jasonp.jones@cemex.com CONTACT NAME: JASON JONES Mobile: PHONE:	(813)269-1240 (813)363-6112 (813)269-1240 (813)363-6112
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): Brief Notes:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still JASON JONES?	
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still JASON JONES? If no, who is?:	
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-silo (cement) w/dust collector-West subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: 5/18/10 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?	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 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? 25.2 tons/hour		☐ 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
DARTH CTACK ENTERVONE & TACK THE CALL A ALL A		
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. XV		□ N.
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?		∐ 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 co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No \(\sum \) N/A - silo not load \(\		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26.8</u> tons/hour	- Mres	∐ 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	Yes Yes	⊠ 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? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute. 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? 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?		□ 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? 26.8 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/dust collector-East subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/10	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
2. 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		☐ No ☐ No
operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 5/18/10	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? 31.3 tons/hour		☐ 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)?	X Yes	☐ No
PART 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?	X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X 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?	X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A − silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 24.8 tons/hour		□ No
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 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 duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mih. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector wh		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	utes	
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? 24.8 tons/hour. 	Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 -CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/dust collector-North subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. D (1	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/10		1,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	∇ V	□ Na
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		∐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	- X Yes	∐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	Yes	⊠ No
d. Date of last VE test: 5/18/10	N	
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?		 No No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 39.5 tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	_	
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? \[\Boxed N/A \]	Yes	☐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	🛛 Yes	∐ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? <u>39</u> tons/hour		
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- 🛚 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
	box for cacif	question)
	- -	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	- X Yes	∐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
	1 . 1 .	,
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo dust collector exhaust points as the silo dust collector exhaust points are silo dust collector exhaust points and the silo dust collector exhaust points are silong the silong exhaust points are silong the silong exhaust points are silong exhaust points		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 39.3 tons/hour	M 168	∐ No
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		
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	nutes	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes and the batching duration.		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	N **	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 39.32 tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 4 -CCB Plant-weigh scale/loadout w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
1. 7	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 5/18/10		,
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	X Yes	□ No
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	\(\bigcirc \text{ 1 es}	□ No
operation?	Yes	⊠ No
d. Date of last VE test: $\frac{5/18/10}{10}$		
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?		∐ No ⊠ No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour		
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	Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	⊠ 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.	' 🛚 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
		1
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	□ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X 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? 	X Yes	☐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		□ №
in not, what was the problem (it known).		
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 l	oaded during ins	spection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	X 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?		∐ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go		
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? m		□ №
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector where the state of the sta		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust of		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durati		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	nutes.	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		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.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	L Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v box for each	only one h 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 ⊠ 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 gener 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	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared		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?		⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹	only one h 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? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- X Yes	⊠ No
3.	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	_	⊠ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □	(check ☑ box for each	•
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	g question 2.))
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes	☐ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, 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] 	6)]	□ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? 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?	5)]	 No 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 □ No
CHANCES		
CHANGES	(check b ox for each	
A 1 1 1 1 1 1 C1		1 ,
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions ur operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	ntive not nits or Yes	⊠ No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	ntive not nits or Yes	
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? 	ative not uits or	⊠ No
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions ur 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?	ative not hits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions ur operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	titive not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes omitted	No No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represents associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions ur operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	titive not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes omitted	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions ur operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	ative not hits or	No No No No No No No