

### **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>1/26/2012</u> ARRIVE: <u>07:30</u>	DEPART: <u>09:15</u>		
FACILITY NAME: ORLANDO-DIVISION ST READY-MIX PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 2201 DIVISION ST			
ORLANDO 32806			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Darryl Fales PHONE: (Mobile:	813)384-3025		
	407)402-4861		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/19/2009 / 7/19/2014 (effective date) (end date)			
Facility Section			
PART I: <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (check ☑ only one box)			
_	Jon-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING			
	(check <b>☑</b> only one box for each question)		
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Darryl Fales</u>	• ,		
Brief Notes:			
2. Is the Authorized Representative still HENRY "HANK" BELCHER?	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?: Tony Dipietro			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?			

# 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 <b>☑</b> only one
1. D	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: 3/23/2011	,
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?	
	I les No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	Yes No
d. Date of last VE test: $\frac{3/23/2011}{4}$	49 N. N.
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 32.98 tons/hour	Tes Ino
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	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE	E test? X Yes No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check <b>☑</b> 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? -	
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.	Its Ino
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 th	e silo conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>28.24</u> tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collect	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) as	
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal bat	ching rate and
duration?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 collect	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher)	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching rate and conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and conducted while batching rate and conducted	
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>5.5</u> n	
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 $0.0$ % 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? 28.24 tons/hour.	

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

<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: 3/23/2011</li> <li>Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> </ol>	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		
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? 32.66 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  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	— Yes ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE te If not, what was the problem (if known)?	st? 🛛 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 visit?		
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the state is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A – silo no		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 33.92 tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?		
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and 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 duration?		
<ul><li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?</li><li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector</li></ul>		
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? 5.5 min	ation? X 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?		
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? <u>33.92</u> tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes No	

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	1		only one
1. Date of last inspection: 3/23/2011	· ·	box for each o	[uestion]
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		_	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		Yes	∐ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		∐ Yes	⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?d. Date of last VE test: 3/23/2011	N/A	Yes	☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days a f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 34.27 tons/hour		<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☐ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the r whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> </ul>	N/A	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during t If not, what was the problem (if known)?	he last VE test?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
DARTH, CTACK EMISSIONS &			
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment		•	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	1	box for each o	luestion)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this s	ite visit?	Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		⊠ Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minut</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>		X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loa			
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 📋			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practic	ce?	⊠ Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? 36.18 tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo d		Yes	⊠ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1$ .  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 induration?			☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching dura			_
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a d			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper			□ Na
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching  2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durat		ĭ Yes	∐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this		Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minu</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> </ul>	-	⊠ Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? 36.18 tons/hour.			

# Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-truck loadout w/shroud & central dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	
Date of last inspection: 3/23/2011     Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?  If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?  b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? N/A  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		No No No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.  Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards		
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control uncor emissions by:	ıfined	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of till paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	\( \text{Yes} \)	□ No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	⊠ Yes	□ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?		☐ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:  a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?  b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 3/23/2011 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	∑ Yes     ☐ Yes	□ No
PA	ART 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
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>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 loade.</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	ded during ins	
	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 $g.1) - g.3$ ) and go to 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and	□ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>5.5</u> minutes</li> <li>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 collection.</li> </ul>	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? <u>5.5</u> 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 0.0 % 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	(cho	ck 🔽 (	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?	⊠ Y ⊠ Y	les les	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.)?		l'es	⊠ 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?		l'es	⊠ 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)?	· 🛭 Y · 🖺 Y · 🖺 Y	les les	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
	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		≤ 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?	iption - 🛭 Y	l'es .	☐ No
<u>GI</u>	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?	🗌 Y	/es	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- 🛛 Y	l'es	☐ No
2	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?		/es	☐ 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?		/es	☐ No

RE	LOCATABLE PLANT:	`	only one
	Is the facility: stationary \( \subseteq \); relocatable \( \subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \( \subseteq \) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary, skip the following</i> ).	box for each	. ,
(Ij	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes	☐ No
	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? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900]		☐ No
	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	- Yes [6)] _	□ No
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	Yes	☐ No
	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:	mit,	
	a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage If YES, what was the purpose?	e)? 🗌 Yes	☐ No
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was	□ Vac	□ Ma
(	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	∐ No □ No
СН	ANGES		only one
Adr	ninistrative Changes:	box for eac	h question)
1. \	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa		
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?		⊠ No
	f YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?		□ No
	v or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:		
3. \$	Since the last registration form submittal has there been		
8	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? d. A change in ownership?		⊠ No ⊠ No
	If the comment of the		
	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change?	_	□ No
	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change?	_	☐ No
		_	□ No
	30 days prior to the change?	_	□ No
	Assefa Hailemriam 1/26/2012	_	□ No

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam from Orange County met Mr.Arlington from Arlington Environmental Services, to audit the visual compliance test for all facility emission units. This visible emissions compliance tests were conducted on EU001,EU002,EU003 and EU005.EU004 was not tested at this time, according Cindy Phillips e-mail dated March 9,2010 document a dust collector at the truck load out or drop point does not require testing. All tests done had observed opacity of zero percent and all laoding rates were above the minimum rate of 25 TPH.