

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:   |  |  |  |
| AIRS ID#: 0951180 DATE: 6/18/07 ARRIVE: 09:05 AM DEPART: 10:45 AM  |  |  |  |
| FACILITY NAME: EWELL/WINTER GARDEN/CEMEX   |  |  |  |
| FACILITY LOCATION: 101 Hennis Road   |  |  |  |
| WINTER GARDEN 34787  |  |  |  |
| RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Mike Miazini, Area Manager PHONE: (407)513-8587  |  |  |  |
| CONTACT NAME: Sigurd Bo PHONE: (407)312-7119   |  |  |  |
| REMITTANCE YEAR: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/4/2003 / 9/4/2008 (effective date) (end date)   |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u> <u>STATUS</u> (check ✓ only one box)   |  |  |  |
| ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))  |  |  |  |
| Stack Emissions  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?   |  |  |  |
| 2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment  |  |  |  |
| controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?   Yes  No  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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate, unless such rate is unachievable in practice?  |  |  |  |
| 4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is "No" then        |  |  |  |
| skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.) \bigsymbol{\times} Yes \bigsymbol{\times} No  |  |  |  |
| a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?  |  |  |  |
| duration?  |  |  |  |
| from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests 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 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

| PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued) (check ☑ appropriate box(es)  |                               |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)  1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of tannual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)   |                               |  |  |
| New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)  2. Did this facility demonstrate:  a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?  b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?   | ☐Yes ☐ No                     |  |  |
| Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)  3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?  |                               |  |  |
| Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.)  4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after test was completed?  |                               |  |  |
|  |                               |  |  |
|  |                               |  |  |
| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))   |                               |  |  |
|  | le 🗌                          |  |  |
| <ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☑; 2) a relocatable ☐; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>Please check ☑ only one box.</i>)</li> <li>If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>,</li> </ol>   | ing<br>□Yes ⊠ No<br>□Yes □ No |  |  |
| <ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☑; 2) a relocatable ☐; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>Please check ☑ only one box.</i>)</li> <li>If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)</li></ol> | ing<br>□Yes ⊠ No<br>□Yes □ No |  |  |

| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)   |   |              |  |  |
|--|---|--------------|--|--|
| (check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))   |   |              |  |  |
| Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)  1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant emissions by:  a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, an  1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas,  2) application of water or environmentally safe dus emissions? | d yards, which shall include one or more of the fol stock piles, and yards? |              |  |  |
| 5) use of spray our, endee, or partial encrosure to fining   | and different at the trop point to the truck.                               | M 1 62   110 |  |  |
|  |   |              |  |  |
| DADENI GREGIAL GONDIEVONG AND DE GERMINEG  | D 1 (2 240 200/A)/D4 E 4 C  |              |  |  |
| PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES A. New or Modified Process Equipment  | - Rule 62-210.300(4)(a)4., F.A.C.   |              |  |  |
| 1. Since the last inspection has there been  |   |              |  |  |
| a) installation of any new process equipment?  |   |              |  |  |
| b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?  |   |              |  |  |
| recent notification form? Yes No   |   |              |  |  |
| d) If you answered <b>YES</b> to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete   |   |              |  |  |
| notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.  |   |              |  |  |
| local program office?  |   | □Yes □ No    |  |  |
|  |   |              |  |  |
| Tom Bessa  | 6/18/07   |              |  |  |
| Inspector's Name (Please Print)  | Date of Inspection  | _            |  |  |
|  | 1   |              |  |  |
| Inspector's Signature  | Approximate Date of Next Inspection   | _            |  |  |
| COMMENTS: No emissions observed during VE test from ce   | ment loading 27.65 T/hr rate 13-14 psig nump pr                             | essure Walk  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:** No emissions observed during VE test from cement loading, 27.65 T/hr rate, 13-14 psig pump pressure. Walk through of yard showed water spray on aggregate piles and wind breaks in good order. No fueling or storage on site. Records of process materials kept monthy (and daily). No fugitive emissions observed. No odors detected.