	WHENTIAL PROTECTION
W OCH	1 Came
FL	ORIDA

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 0950134 DATE: 10/14/2009 ARRIVE: 7:52 AM DEPART: 10:48 AM FACILITY NAME: CEMEX Construction Materials-EAST ORLANDO READY-MIX PLANT FACILITY LOCATION: 7244 NARCOOSSEE RD ORLANDO 32812 OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SIGURD BO PHONE: (407)841-8409 CONTACT NAME: Rusty Richards PHONE: (407)277-0589 ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/12/2008 / 10/12/2013
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) □ IN COMPLIANCE ⊠ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)? 2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity? 3. 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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate, unless such rate is unachievable in practice? 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is "No" then skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5 a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? Yes No b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? Yes No 5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?

PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued)			
(check ☑ appropriate box(es)			
 <u>Compliance Demonstration</u> - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.) 1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)			
New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)			
2. Did this facility demonstrate:			
a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?			
b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date? [Yes] No			
 Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? Xest Complexity Action form Submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?			
 Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.) 4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed? ∑Yes ∑No 			

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.

(check ⊠ appropriate box(es))
 Is this facility: 1) a stationary ⊠; 2) a relocatable □; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>Please check ⊠only one box.</i>)

Yes ⊠ No Yes □ No
=
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Yes 🗌 No
Ye Ye Ye

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)

(check ☑ appropriate box(es))

Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)

- 1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:
 - a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following:

	1)	paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? Xes No
	2)	application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control
		emissions? Xes No
	3)	removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to
		re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? Xes No
	4)	reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of
		particulate matter from stock piles? 🖾 Yes 🗌 No
b)	use	e of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Xes No

PART IV: Special Conditions And PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C. A. New or Modified Process Equipment 1. Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment?----- b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?----- C) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?----- □Yes Visit in the second sec

Ilka Bundy

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

10/14/2009

Date of Inspection

10/19/2009

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The weigh hopper is enclosed inside of a building. A V.E. is not required for the weigh hopper. Staff on site had to replace the connector for the cement tanker to hook up to. Staff took about an hour to replace the connector before the first V.E. could begin. Fugitive emissions were observed coming from the hatch seal on the flyash silo during the flyash loading process. Approximately 11 minitues into the loading process, visible emissions were observed to be around 5% opacity. The emissions progressively got worse as time went by. At 10:33 AM, emissions from the hatch seal were aproximately 40-50%. The inspector, Ilka Bundy, notified Rusty Richards, Operations Manager, of the problem. The inspector told Mr. Richards to fix the seal right away. Mr. Richards stated he would have it repaired by the end of tomorrow. The inspector called Sig Bo, Regional Manager, and explained what was going on. Ilka requested to observe another flyash tanker loading the silo after the repairs were completed. Rusty Richards scheduled a flyash tanker for Monday, 10/19/09. Bill Rhodes agreed to observe the flyash tanker loading scheduled for Monday to ensure the seal is repaired. All emission points had an observed opacity of 0%. The flyash loading rate was 25.86 tph. The cement loading rate was 25.7 tph.