

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

NSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)					
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 0950154 DATE: <u>12/30/2010</u> ARRIVE: <u>2:45 PM</u> DEPART:	4:30 PM				
FACILITY NAME: ACTION READY MIX CONCRETE INC-ORLANDO					
FACILITY LOCATION: 7120 OVERLAND RD					
ORLANDO 32810-3422					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: MARIO MARIANI Email: CONTACT NAME: MARIO MARIANI Email: Mobile: PHONE: (407)578-120 Mobile: Mobile:					
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/20/2009 / 3/20/2014 (effective date) (end date)					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check ☑ only one				
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Dan McQuaig</u>	(check ✓ only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes: <u>Production and Sales</u>					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still MARIO MARIANI?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still MARIO MARIANI? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	- ⊠ Yes □No ⊠ Yes □No				

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo(cement)w/silotop baghouse, 500 Bbl capacity subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
	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	⋉ Yes⋉ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	operation? \boxtimes N/A d. Date of last VE test: $\underline{1/4/2010}$	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? 34.3 tons/hour	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ 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
PA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	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</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 conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A − silo not loaded during inspection.		
	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>36</u> tons/hour 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?2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate	Yes Yes	☐ No
	duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	- Yes	☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? minute.	? 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 energity of 0% for the highest six minute average.		☐ 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? 30.46 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-silo(flyash)w/silotop baghouse, 300 Bbl capacity subject to 5% Opacity Limit

R. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	1.	Date of last inspection: 1/4/2010 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 operation?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	No No No No No No No No
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit? —			∐ Tes	N0
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? ———————————————————————————————————	PA			•
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?	1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? ————————————————————————————————————			Yes	☐ No
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection. e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? Yes No f. What was the silo loading rate? 30.47 tons/hour 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 h. 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 and duration? Yes No 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate 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? Yes No 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes. 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? Yes No b. The visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? Yes No b. The visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? Yes No		c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?				
f. What was the silo loading rate? 30.47 tons/hour 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 h. 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? ————————————————————————————————————		f. What was the silo loading rate? 30.47 tons/hour		—
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?			_	M N0
duration?				☐ No
 h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate 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? ☐ Yes ☐ No 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes. 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? ☐ Yes ☐ No 		duration?	- 🗌 Yes	☐ No
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? Yes No 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes. 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector 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 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?				
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes. 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	ector	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?				∐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? 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	_
		c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-batcher/truck loadout w/boot & spray ring subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Date of last inspection: 1/4/2010 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? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes No
DARTH BY DARTHY ATTONIC DAR COMMAND DAR C	
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check \square only one box for each question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control undersions by:	confined
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary 	y to
control emissions?	Yes
particulate matter?	nt of
particulate matter from stock piles?	Yes No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck	k? 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

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ 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?		☐ 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? 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 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared		0?	
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	
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ☑ only one box for each 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?	- 🛛 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 box for each	•	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (.)	
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	
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi 	y prior to changing location? Yes	☐ No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	□ No	
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	air construction or air operation permit,		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Yes	☐ No	
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long i co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes	□ No □ No	
CHANGES (check ✓ only one box for each 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 relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits of the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? Yes	⊠ No □ No	
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?	? Yes stantially different? Yes	NoNoNoNoNo	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrat 30 days prior to the change?		☐ No	
Ilka Bundy	12/30/2010		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/31/2011		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		

COMMENTS: Ilka Bundy met with Greg Gonzales, consultant from GG Environmental Solutions, Inc., on December 30, 2010, to audit the annual compliance test on the cement and fly ash storage silos. No batching occurred during the compliance test since the test was conducted late in the daydue to the sun angle. Batching emissions are controlled by a rubber boot and a spray ring. There is no dust collector for this unit. The observed opacity on both storage silos was zero percent. The loading rates for both units was acceptable. The inspector left the site after observing at least 14 minutes of the fly ash tanker test. The facility is in compliance with their permit at this time. This plant may be sold in the near future.