

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN		SPECTION (FUI)		AINT/DISCOVE	· · · —		
ΑI	IRS ID#: 0950134 DATE: <u>10</u>	<u>/21/2010</u>	ARRIVE:	<u>07:43AM</u>	DEPART: <u>10:15</u>	<u>AM</u>	
FA	ACILITY NAME: EAST ORI	LANDO READY-MIX F	PLANT				
FA	ACILITY LOCATION:	7244 NARCOOSSEE R	D				
		ORLANDO 32812					
CC				PHONI Mobile: PHONI Mobile:	E: (407)841-8409		
PA	ART I: INSPECTION COME ☐ IN COMPLIANCE		•	one box)	NT Non-COMPLIANC	E	
1.	Name(s) of facility representate Brief Notes:	<u> </u>			*		only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Representati If no, who is?:	ve still SIGURD BO?			×	Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility pro Is the facility contact still SIG If no, who is?:					Yes Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE If yes, was the compliance aut					Yes Yes	□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-split silo, compartment #1, w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 10/14/2009	(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?	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? 37.5 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? n/a 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)?	? \(\text{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 n 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average. 	X Yes	☐ No	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	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 loading rate?			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 37.5 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 $g.3$. 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? m h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector where the second seco			
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 durati 2) What was the batching rate? <u>n/a</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>6.0</u> minutes.		☐ 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 <u>0.0</u> % 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? <u>37.5</u> tons/hour. 	X Yes	□ No	

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-fully enclosed weigh hopper w/fabric filter bag subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 10/14/2009 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Tyes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
Un	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. acconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Sorveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:	ned	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?		 No No No No No
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	X Yes	☐ No
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section 5 -CCB Plant-truck loadout w/shroud & central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No No No
	 j. What was the actual batching rate? n/a 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>0.0</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 contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	led during ins	
	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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	is separate	
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? n/a tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6.0 minutes.	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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 37.5 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C</u> (ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
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 ∑ 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?		⊠ 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?		⊠ 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?	-	No No No No No
	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propan	e/yr	
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
<u>G</u>]	ENERAL 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?		⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator:		
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- X Yes	☐ No
2	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?	- X Yes	☐ No
٥.	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	_	□ No

<u>KF</u>	RELOCATABLE PLANT: (check ☑ only one				
	Is the facility: stationary \(\subseteq \); relocatable \(\subseteq \); or consisting of to concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plant		box for each g question 2.	• ,	
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	 nw.)	- Yes	☐ No	
	a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Departmer e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one businessb. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation N	s day prior to changing location?		☐ No	
	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five b c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation No.	ousiness days following a relocation?	- Yes	☐ No	
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at leas	t five business days prior to relocation?	Yes	☐ No	
3.	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a sepa and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions		mit,		
	a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routing If YES, what was the purpose?)?	☐ No	
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how local co-located at the permitted facility?		TYes	□ No	
	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duratio	n?	- Yes	☐ No	
<u>C</u> E	HANGES		(check v box for each	only one	
	Iministrative Changes:			i question)	
	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number associated with a change in ownership or with a physical reloc				
	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor		its or		
		administrative change at the facility?	- Yes	⊠ No	
TAT.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30	administrative change at the facility?	- Yes	⊠ No □ No	
	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	administrative change at the facility?	- Yes	= "	
	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30	administrative change at the facility? days of the change?	Yes Yes	= "	
3.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent?	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No	
3.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different?	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
3.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different?	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No	
3.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different? stration form and the appropriate fee sub	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
3.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership?	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different? stration form and the appropriate fee sub	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
 4. 	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership?	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different? stration form and the appropriate fee sub	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
 4. 	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership?	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different? stration form and the appropriate fee sub	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	
 4. 	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 ew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is d. A change in ownership? If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new regis 30 days prior to the change?	administrative change at the facility? days of the change? nent? substantially different? stration form and the appropriate fee sub	-	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No	

COMMENTS: Facility has five emissions, in which four are required to be tested annually for visible emissions. Emissions unit 1 and 5 were done on this date. The loading rates were acceptable and the observed opacity was 0.0%. Emissions unit #4 was not tested for visible emissions. This unit is subject to the 20% opacity (Reasonable precautions) limit.