	WEITUL PROTECTION	
NG.BI	1 Car	
E FI	ORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION <u>TYPE</u> :	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0950135 DA	TE: <u>12/3/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>12:15 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>1:30 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: WI	INTER GARDEN READY-MIX	(RMC) PLANT	
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 100 Hennis Rd		
	WINTER GARDEN 34	787-2401	
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: cburns@titan CONTACT NAME: K Email: kfolsom@tita ENTITLEMENT PERIO	ELLY FOLSOM* mamerica.com	DY BURNS* PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	
Facility Section			
PART I: INSPECTION	PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)		
IN COMPLIAN	CE MINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFICAN	T Non-COMPLIANCE

PA	ART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u>	(check 🗹	2
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Don Kelley</u>	box for each	question)
	Brief Notes: <u>Plant Manager</u>		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still CINDY BURNS*?	Xes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still KELLY FOLSOM*?	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	$\begin{array}{c c} & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \end{array} Yes$	□No □No

## **Emissions Unit Section**

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       11/17/2011	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	☐ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 11/17/2011</li> </ul>	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? $\sim 26$ tons/hour	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	X Yes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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
<ul><li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li><li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li></ul>	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	Yes 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? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34.6</u> tons/hour	_	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		
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate</li> </ol>	te and	∐ No
duration?	ites	No No
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		
<ul> <li>conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?</li> <li>2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute</li> </ul>	? 🗌 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?	🛛 Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? <u>34.6</u> tons/hour.</li> </ul>	_	

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only	. ono
	box for each ques	
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	🛛 Yes 🗌	] No ] No ] No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		] No
<ul> <li>b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gen permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		] No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes 🗌 🖾 Yes 🗌 🖾 Yes 🗌	] No ] No ] No ] No ] No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal pro275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consu for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		] No

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
<ul> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces</li> </ul>		🗌 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:		(check ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?			•
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>	)	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notified</li> </ul>	y prior to changing location?		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five bus c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif	iness days following a relocation? ication Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(	Yes	🗌 No
<ul><li>to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fi</li><li>3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate</li></ul>			L No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions ur a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine p If YES, what was the purpose?	hit in that separate permit:		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?		🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?			□ No
CHANGES		(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of	of the facility or authorized represen		question
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation	on of the facility or any emissions u	inits or	
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adu 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day			⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:			
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?			
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement		🗌 Yes	🖂 No
		🗌 Yes	No No
<ul> <li>c. Replacement of existing process equipment with equipment that is sub</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul>	t? ostantially different?	Yes	
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub	it? ostantially different? 	Yes Yes Yes	🛛 No 🛛 No
<ul> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership?</li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration</li> </ul>	it? ostantially different? 	Yes Yes Yes ibmitted	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership?</li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration</li> </ul>	it? ostantially different? 	Yes Yes Yes ibmitted	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership?</li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ul>	it? ostantially different? ution form and the appropriate fee su	Yes Yes Yes ibmitted	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership?</li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?</li> <li>Bill Rhodes</li> </ul>	It?	Yes Yes Yes ibmitted	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No

**COMMENTS:** OCEPD personnel arrived at the facility at approximately 12:15 PM, to audit 1-VE on the CCB plant silo/cement w/silotop baghouse. This is a re-test that was audited on 10/25/2012, however mechanical problems were encountered which caused this VE to be re-scheduled. Personnel present were Abby Diaz, Environmental Engineer, representing Tarmac America, LLC, and Don Kelley, Plant Manager, also representing Tarmac America, LLC. A 30-minute VE was audited and 0% opacity was observed. The site was wet, and no objectionable odors or dust was observed leaving the property.