

# **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN		AL (INS1, INS2) SPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/E		Y (CI)		
ΑI	RS ID#: 0950135 DATE: <u>9/2</u> 0	6/2013	ARRIVE: <u>9:55 A</u>	<u>M</u>	DEPART: <u>10:40</u>	<u>AM</u>	
FA	CILITY NAME: WINTER G	ARDEN READY-MIX	(RMC) PLANT				
FA	CILITY LOCATION:	00 Hennis Rd					
	V	WINTER GARDEN 3	4787-2401				
CC		com OLSOM*	DY BURNS*	PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(954)481-2800 (954)242-0183 (954)242-0183		
PA	Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
	Name(s) of facility representati Brief Notes: 386-547-1950	_			*		only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Representative If no, who is?:	ve still CINDY BURNS	*?		🛭 Y	es es	□No
3.	If different, did the facility prov Is the facility contact still KELI If no, who is?:					es es	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE If yes, was the compliance auth					es es	□No ⊠No

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-splitsilo(flyash)westcompartmentw/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/25/2012 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No
	<ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <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>	⊠ Yes	□ No
PA	RT 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
	<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></ul>	⊠ 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?	ded during ins	
	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	⊠ 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
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minuth.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	n is separate	
	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? 6 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?	<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☐ No
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? 23.44 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No

# **Facility Section (continued)**

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 o	
b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?	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 of 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 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? 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)?	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propar 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane		?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consump for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	tion  Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 o box for each q	
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
Does the owner or operator:     a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (A		box for each g question 2.)	question)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		- Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or         e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificent</li> </ul>	prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ess days following a relocation?ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	e business days prior to relocation? -	Yes	☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?	in that separate permit:		☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?		- Yes - Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES  Administrative Changes:		(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	n of the facility or any emissions unnistrative change at the facility?	box for each tive not its or - Yes	
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days.	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or -	question)
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admit 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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?	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or - Yes	question)  No No No No No
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admit 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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 c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or -	question)  No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admit 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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 c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or -	question)  No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admit 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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?	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or -	question)  No No No No No No No
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admit 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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?	n of the facility or any emissions un nistrative change at the facility? of the change?	box for each tive not its or -	question)  No No No No No No No

**COMMENTS:** Inspector, Ilka Bundy, met with Dean Meyers, consultant for General Environmental Engineering Inc., on September 26, 2013, to audit emission unit 003. The tanker took 67 minutes to load 26.18 tons of cement into the west-most compartment of the cement silo. The loading rate of 23.44 is slightly below the minimum loading rate of 25 tons per hour. The inspector/Environmental Team Leader accepts the loading rate for this test. No visible emissions were observed during the compliance test. No objectionable odors were noted. No unconfined or uncontrolled emissions were observed.