

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 0950179 DATE: <u>11/5/2010</u>	ARRIVE: 08:36AM	DEPART: 10:35AM				
FACILITY NAME: CORESLAB STRUCTURES ((ORL), INC.					
FACILITY LOCATION: 11041 ROCKET BLVD						
ORLANDO 3282	24					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: ROBERT OWENS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 12/1/2005 / 12/1/ (effective date) (end da	Моb РНО Моb	DNE: (407)855-3191				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
DADT H. ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	7	_				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Chuck Prey		(check ✓ only one box for each question)				
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still MIKE HAR If no, who is?:	RISON?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrat. 3. Is the facility contact still ROBERT OWENS? If no, who is?: Chuck Preyer						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least						

Emissions Unit Section 1 -CEMENT SILO WITH BAG HOUSE subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11/6/2009 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check 🗹 box for each	
 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? 25.35 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? 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)?	X Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹	only one
cholosed 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?	X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X 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?	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? <u>25.35</u> tons/hour	X Yes	☐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$) and go	to h.	☐ No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching 		⊠ No
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? mi	Yes	⊠ No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector wh		
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 duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mir	on? 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?		☐ 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>25.35</u> tons/hour. 	X Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –Storage bin with baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11/6/2009	(check ☑ obox for each q	only one uestion)
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
operation?	Yes 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? <u>25.35</u> 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? 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)?	? X Yes	□ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 o	only one uestion)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?		∐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 25.35 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	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		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 25.35 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 $g.3$ 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? n h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector w		
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 durate the batching rate and dura	ion?	☐ No
 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi 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?	X Yes	☐ 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>25.35</u> tons/hour. 	X Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(ch	ack 🔽	only one
				question)
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?	\boxtimes	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?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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	 No No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	<u>ane/yr</u> e/yr	≤ 1.00°	?
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?	ption	Yes	⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one 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?	. 🕅	Ves	□ 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?	- 🖂		□ 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?		Vec	□ No
	permit and Department rules:	$\boldsymbol{\square}$	100	140

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	hov for	k ☑ only one each question)
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both state concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If</i> an example of the facility: stationary ⊠; or consisting of both statements of the facility: stationary ⊠; or consisting of both statements of the facility: stationary ⊠; or consisting of both stationary ⊠; or consisting of both statements of the facility: stationary ⊠; or consisting of both statements of the facility: stationary ⊠; or consisting of both stationary with the facility of the fa	tionary and relocatable	• ,
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.)	\(\sum \) Y	es 🗌 No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Loe- e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day probe. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat 	rior to changing location? Ye	es 🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busines c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificati	s days following a relocation? You Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five b 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air	construction or air operation permit,	es 📙 No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose? If YES, what was the purpose?		es 🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it we co-located at the permitted facility?	Y	_
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
CHANGES		k ☑ only one each question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admining 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	e facility or authorized representative not of the facility or any emissions units or strative change at the facility?	es 🗵 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 substated. A change in ownership?	ntially different? Y	es 🖾 No es 🗵 No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		es 🗌 No
Assefa Hailemariam	11/5/2010	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_
	~11/2011	_
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: Facility has two emission units in which are required to be tested annually for visible emissions. The observed opacity was 0.0% and loading rates were acceptable.