

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☐ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐ RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 0951194 DATE: <u>3/23/11</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:55 AM</u> DEPAR	T: <u>11:55 AM</u>			
FACILITY NAME: ORLANDO-DIVISION ST READY-MIX PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION: 2201 DIVISION ST				
ORLANDO 32806-				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: HENRY "HANK" BELCHER PHONE: (813)384-3025 Email: Hank.Belcher@preferredmaterials.com Mobile: (352)279-0404 CONTACT NAME: Junior Moss/Plant Manager PHONE: (407)947-2798 Email: Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/19/2009 / 7/19/2014 (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			
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Henry "Hank" Belcher</u>	box for each question)			
Brief Notes:				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still HENRY "HANK" BELCHER? If no, who is?:	⊠ Yes □No			
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still MIKE BIAGINI? If no, who is?: Junior Moss/Plant Manager				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?				

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)	
 Date of last inspection: 3/09/10 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?		☐ No☐ No	
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 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? 35.86 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)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(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 0 % 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? \(\subseteq \text{ Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{ No} \) \(\subseteq \text{ N/A} - \text{silo not loa} \) e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? ~ 31.4 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?	☐ Yes	☐ No	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	- Yes	☐ No	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col	lector	⊠ No	
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? minut		M N0	
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 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? ~32.98 tons/hour. 	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No	

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

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u> 1. Date of last inspection: <u>3/9/2010</u> 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each 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		
	N/A Yes No	
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? ~36.83 tons/hour	X Yes No	
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	N/A Yes No	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the las If not, what was the problem (if known)?	t VE test? X Yes No	
PART 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 vis	it?	
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? 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? 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? 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? f. What was the silo loading rate? 30.8 tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust co <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g$.		
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 norma duration?	Yes No	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust co	llector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate a 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	and duration? Yes No	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site v a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	isit?	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute avera c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 32.66 tons/hour. 		

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-silo #3 (slag) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one	
1. Date of last inspection: 3/9/10	box for each	question)	
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:			
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		☐ 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 commence operation?d. Date of last VE test: 3/9/10		☐ No	
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 day f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? ~32.33 tons/hour		☐ No ☐ No	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	N/A Yes	□ No ☑ No	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during If not, what was the problem (if known)?	ng the last VE test? X Yes	☐ No	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑	only one	
cherosea storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during th	is site visit? 🖂 Yes	☐ No	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ No	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-ming. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity ling. If not, what was the problem (if known)? 		☐ 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? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No		_	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in pra	actice? X Yes	∐ No	
 f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.7</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the sil 		⊠ No	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions		☐ No	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the duration?	the normal batching rate and	□ No	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching of		☐ N0	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hop	<u> </u>		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batch 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching du		⊠ No	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during t	this site visit? 🔀 Yes	☐ No	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ No	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-min c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity lin 		☐ No	
d. What was the process rate? ~ 34.27 tons/hour.			

Emissions Unit Section 4 -CCB Plant-truck loadout w/shroud & central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 3/9/10 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?	_	NoNoNoNoNoNo
	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 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✓ Yes✓ Yes	☐ No☐ No☐ No
PA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching raduration?	- Yes	☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector. 	n is separate	
	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? ~6 minutes.	? Xes	☐ 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 opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	∑ Yes∑ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 5 -CCB Plant-weigh hopper, w/individual dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 3/9/10 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?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)?		□ No
PA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	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?	Yes Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minuth. h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector. 	n is separate	
	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? 6 minutes.	Yes 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 opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	✓ Yes✓ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑	only one	
		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?	⊠ 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.)?		⊠ 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?		⊠ 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propane/yr ≤ 1.00 ? gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane/yr		
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	
CI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			
<u> </u>	AND COMPTIONS	(check ☑ box for each		
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?		⊠ No	
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		□ No	
	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?	- 🔀 Yes	☐ No	

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	only one		
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable	box for each	question)		
	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		□ V	□ Na		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific		∐ Yes	∐ No		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing			☐ No		
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica			_		
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	e business days prior to relocation? -	Yes	☐ No		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate		nit,			
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur		12 Nos	□ No		
If YES, what was the purpose?	pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)	7. <u> </u>			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it		_			
co-located at the permitted facility?		- Yes	∐ No		
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		- Yes	☐ No		
CHANGES		(chock $$	only one		
		box for each			
Administrative Changes:	d . C. '1'		4		
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 admi			⊠ No		
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days			☐ 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 subs	tantially different?	- Yes	No No		
d. A change in ownership?		· U Yes	⊠ No		
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration	on form and the appropriate fee sub-	mitted			
30 days prior to the change?		· Yes	☐ No		
Norma Ali	3/23/2011				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
	3/23/2012				
Lugar et en la Circustina	Ait- Data of Nant Inc				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection			
COMMENTS: Norma Ali arrived at the Facility at 8:55 am and was	told by West Jones. Batchman, that	the tests wer	e scheduled		
at 10:00 AM. On the VE notification sent to EPD, the starting time was at 9:00 AM. Ms. Ali met with Noah Handley, consultant					
from Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., around 10:00 AM and proceeded to audit the visual emission test.					
FIJO01 Coment Sile Openity Observed = 00/ Janking and 2000) tab				
EU001 Cement Silo Opacity Observed = 0% Loading rate = 32.98 EU002 Flyash silo Opacity Observed = 0% Loading rate = 32.66					
	tph				
EU003 Slag silo Opacity Observed = 0% Loading rate = 34.27					

EU005 Weigh Hopper - 2 trucks batching were observed Opacity = 0%

Roads were paved and wet, sprinklers were on at the raw materials piles.

No objectionable odors or PM was observed leaving the property.