



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

**INSPECTION TYPE:** ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)   
 RE-INSPECTION (FUI)  ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

|   |                              |                               |                                |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>AIRS ID#:</b> 0950221  | <b>DATE:</b> <u>1/9/2012</u> | <b>ARRIVE:</b> <u>8:30 AM</u> | <b>DEPART:</b> <u>10:00 AM</u> |
| <b>FACILITY NAME:</b> ALLIED PRECAST  |                              |                               |                                |
| <b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 5640 CARDER RD<br>ORLANDO 32810-4785                  |                              |                               |                                |
| <b>OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:</b> BANNER THOMAS                           |                              | <b>PHONE:</b> (407)293-8510   |                                |
| <b>Email:</b>   |                              | <b>Mobile:</b>                |                                |
| <b>CONTACT NAME:</b> BANNER THOMAS  |                              | <b>PHONE:</b> (407)293-8510   |                                |
| <b>Email:</b>   |                              | <b>Mobile:</b>                |                                |
| <b>ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:</b> 10/3/2009 / 10/3/2014<br>(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 box for each question)

1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Banner Thomas  
 Brief Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Authorized Representative still BANNER THOMAS? -----  Yes    ..No  
 If no, who is?: \_\_\_\_\_  
 If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? -----  Yes    ..No

3. Is the facility contact still BANNER THOMAS? -----  Yes    ..No  
 If no, who is?: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? -----  Yes    ..No  
 If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? -----  Yes    ..No

Emissions Unit Section

1-CCB Plant-2 silos(cement)#1&2 interconnected w/cent.baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check [X] only one box for each question)

- 1. Date of last inspection: 7/13/2010
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years? [X] Yes [ ] No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year? [ ] Yes [X] No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? [X] N/A [ ] Yes [ ] No
d. Date of last VE test: 7/13/2010
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? [X] Yes [ ] No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? [X] Yes [ ] No
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 38.07 tons/hour
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] N/A [ ] Yes [ ] No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? [ ] Yes [X] No
j. What was the actual batching rate? \_\_\_\_\_ tons/hour
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-- [X] Yes [ ] No
If not, what was the problem (if known)? \_\_\_\_\_

PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment

(check [X] only one 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 0 % for the highest six-minute average.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? [X] Yes [ ] No
If not, what was the problem (if known)? \_\_\_\_\_
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? -- [X] 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? [X] Yes [ ] No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 32.15 tons/hour
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? --- [ ] Yes [X] 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? [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 0 % for the highest six-minute average.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? [X] Yes [ ] No
d. What was the process rate? 32.15 tons/hour.

## Facility Section (continued)

### CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

(check  only one  
box for each 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? -----  Yes  No
  - b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? -----  Yes  No
  - c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant? -----  Yes  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.)? -----  Yes  No  
 If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? \_\_\_\_\_
  
  - 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  
 If YES, what other general permit units or activities? \_\_\_\_\_
  
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? -----  Yes  No
  - b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? -----  Yes  No
  - c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? -----  Yes  No
  - d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? -----  Yes  No
  - e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? -----  Yes  No
$$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{gal gasoline/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$$
  
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? -----  Yes  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
  - 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? -----  Yes  No

**RELOCATABLE PLANT:**

(check  only one box for each question)

- 1. Is the facility: stationary ; relocatable ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable  concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? *(If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)*
- 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? -----  Yes  No  
*(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below. )*
  - a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? -----  Yes  No
  - b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? ----  Yes  No
  - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? ---  Yes  No
- 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:
  - a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)?  Yes  No  
 If YES, what was the purpose?
  - b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? -----  Yes  No  
 If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? -----  Yes  No

**CHANGES**

(check  only one box for each question)

Administrative Changes:

- 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? ----  Yes  No
- 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? -----  Yes  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? -----  Yes  No
  - b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? -----  Yes  No
  - c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? -----  Yes  No
  - d. A change in ownership? -----  Yes  No
- 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? -----  Yes  No

Bill Rhodes

1/9/2012

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

12/31/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** The inspector, Bill Rhodes, representing OCEPD, met with Joseph Stine, the consultant, and Mr. Tres Thomas, Sales Representative, of the facility, at approximately 8:30 AM, on January 9, 2012. Sara Greivell, the emission reader, representing Grove Scientific & Engineering, was also present. The annual compliance test was performed on the small cement silo. Portland cement was pumped into the small silo, and controlled by a baghouse on the tallest silo. A 30-minute VE was performed, and the observed opacity was 0%. 26.79 tons of Portland cement was pumped in 50-minutes resulting in a loading rate of 32.15 TPH, which is acceptable. At the time of the compliance test, the facility was operating on an as-needed basis, with a minimal crew on-site. The facility's yard is all dirt, however was wet, during the inspection to prevent particulate matter from leaving the property. No objectionable odors were detected. The facility is in compliance at the time of the inspection.

