

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		LAINT/DISCOVE	· / -	
ΑI	RS ID#: 0510019 DA 7	ΓΕ: <u>7/14/2014</u>	ARRIVE	: <u>8:55 am</u>	DEPART: <u>10:05 am</u>	
FA	FACILITY NAME: LABELLE RM FACILITY					
FA	CILITY LOCATION	: 1101 Forestry Div	vision Rd			
		LABELLE 3393	935-3009			
CO	OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JASON JONES Email: CONTACT NAME: JASON JONES Email: Mobile: Mobile:					
EN	NTITLEMENT PERIC		19/2018 1 date)			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PA	ART II: ONSITE INTE	ODUCTORY MEETIN	NG		(1.1.17	
		ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING of facility representative(s): William Duncan (check ✓ only one box for each question)		•		
2.	·	esentative still JASON JC	ONES?		X Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facilist the facility contact st. If no, who is?:	ility provide an administratill JASON JONES?	rative update within	30 days?		□No □No
4.		ting VE test(s) during tod nce authority notified at l				□No □No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION				
1. D				
1. Date of last inspection: 1/27/2010				
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	s 🛛 No		
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		, 🖂 110		
operation?		s 🗌 No		
d. Date of last VE test: 10/29/2013		,		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days a	Ifter the test? X Yes	s \square No		
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?				
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 27.7 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?	- N/A Yes	s 🗌 No		
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes	s 🔲 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	s 🗌 No		
If not, what was the problem (if known)?				
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other				
enclosed storage and conveying equipment				
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this	site visit? 🛛 Yes	s \square No		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		s 📙 No		
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute		□ N.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit	? X Yes	s 📙 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				
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? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.				
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in pract				
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		, 🗀 110		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo	lust collector? Yes	s 🛛 No		
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$				
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions tes		s 🔲 No		
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the				
duration?	Yes	s 🗌 No		
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching dur	ation? minutes			
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a controlled by	lust collector which is separa	nte		
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		s 🗌 No		
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching dura				
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this		=		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		s 📙 No		
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0% for the highest six-minute				
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit	? X Yes	s 🗌 No		
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.				

Emissions Unit Section 3 -CCB Plant-silo (slag) w/silo dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 only	y one		
	box for each ques			
1. Date of last inspection: 1/27/2010	4	/		
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ v □	NI.		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		No No		
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		No		
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencin operation?		No		
d. Date of last VE test: <u>11/26/2013</u>	_			
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days		No		
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	\(\sum \text{Yes}\)	No		
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 24.7 tons/hour	a mamount atata			
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?		No		
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		No		
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour		110		
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during	g the last VE test? X Yes	No		
If not, what was the problem (if known)?				
DADEN CELEVISIONS & P. 111 (4.11)				
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	The state of the s	y one		
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each ques	tion)		
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this	s 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minut		110		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit		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? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No \(\sum \)				
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in prac	tice? Yes	No		
f. What was the silo loading rate? 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 $g.1$		110		
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions te		No		
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the				
duration?	Yes	No		
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching du				
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a				
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopped		NT.		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durations		No		
2) What was the batching rate?tons/nour. What was the batching duta 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during the		No		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		No		
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minu				
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limi		No		
d. What was the process rate?tons/hour.				

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check	only one	
			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? 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?	Yes Yes	s 🗍 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.)?		s 🛭 No	
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		s 🛭 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?	Yes Yes Yes	s)
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	<u>ine/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	s 🗌 No)
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check 🗹 only one				
Gi	ENERAL CONDITIONS		only one ach 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?	_		
2.	Does the owner or operator:			
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all			
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		s 🗌 No	
	permit and Department rules?	- X Yes	s 🗌 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? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i>)				
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.)		L Yes	∐ No	
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or L	ocal Air Program by telephone,			
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p	5 5		☐ No	
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business			☐ No	
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat	ion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900([6)]		
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five l	ousiness days prior to relocation?	Yes Yes	☐ No	
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate ai		ermit,		
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit i		\0 \press_xx		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose?	ose (i.e, there is no repeated usag	ge)? LYes	∐ No	
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it v	vas			
co-located at the permitted facility?			□ No	
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		L Yes	∐ No	
<u> </u>				
CHANGES		(check 🗹	only one	
A location Change		box for each		
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the changes in the name.	ne facility or authorized represent	tative not		
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation				
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? -			⊠ No	
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?			⊠ No	
d. A change in ownership?		Yes	⊠ No	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		bmitted \ Yes	□ No	
V 1 C				
Diane Loughlin	7/14/2014			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
Diane Loughein				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ir	nspection		
COMMENTS:				