

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, IN RE-INSPECTION (		· / <u> </u>		
AIRS ID#: 0951194 DATE: <u>5/28/2014</u>	ARRIVE: 9:45 am	DEPART: <u>11:00 am</u>		
FACILITY NAME: ORLANDO-DIVISION	ST READY-MIX PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 2201 S DIVIS	SION AVE			
ORLANDO	32805-6230			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATI Email: CONTACT NAME: ADRIENNE COPPOC Email: adrienne.coppock@oldcastlemateri ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: / (effective date)	Mobile CK PHON	NE: (813)384-3089		
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEI  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Toni  Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still HENI If no, who is?:	RY "HANK" BELCHER?			
If different, did the facility provide an admi 3. Is the facility contact still ADRIENNE COF If no, who is?:				
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) durin If yes, was the compliance authority notified				

# 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 ☑ only one
	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/7/2013}{2}$	4
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ V □ N-
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?	N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 2/7/2013	
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? 30.8 tons/hour	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the repor	rt state
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	N/A Yes No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the la	ast VE test? ⊠ Yes □ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check <b>☑</b> only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)
	box for each question)
1 XV	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site v	risit? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No
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 aver	
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? \omega Yes \omega No \omega N/A	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	
f. What was the silo loading rate? 36.05 tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust of	collector? Yes 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 test?	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the norm	nal batching 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 of from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (bat	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate	
2) What was the batching rate? ~200 tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site	
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 ave	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	
d. What was the process rate? 36.05 tons/hour.	

# 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>2/7/2013</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?	
operation?	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? 32.52 tons/hour	X Yes
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?</li></ul>	√A  Yes  No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last If not, what was the problem (if known)?	VE test? ⊠ 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	? \( \sum \) Yes \( \sup \) No
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	
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 that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ∑ No ∑ N/A − s	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? 32.22 tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust colle <i>If YES</i> , 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 test?	Yes No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal duration?	Yes No
<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 collection.</li></ul>	ector which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batche conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate an 2) What was the batching rate? ~200 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 m	d duration? ⊠ Yes ☐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site vis a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	it?
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute av</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 32.22 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	

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

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b>	only one
1	D	box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 2/7/2013		= '
۷.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	✓ Vos	□ No
	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?	∑ Yes	∐ No ⊠ No
	·	☐ Yes	⊠ No
	c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
	d. Date of last VE test: 2/7/2013  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?	<ul><li>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☐ No
	<ul> <li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 31.30 tons/hour</li> <li>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</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> </ul>	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No ⊠ 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?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	Yes	☐ No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PΔ	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(1.17	1
17	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹	only one
	encrosed 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 $\underline{0}$ % 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)?	Yes Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ N/A – silo not load		
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	· 🔀 Yes	∐ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>28.83</u> 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 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? minu		
	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 coll		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? ~200 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.	! ⊠ Yes	∐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ No
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>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
	d. What was the process rate? 28.83 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 ☑ only one box for each question)
Date of last inspection: 2/7/2013     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: (0)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?     c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	X Yes No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check ☑ only one
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles</u>	
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions emissions by:	s to control unconfined
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include     1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?     2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals we control emissions?	
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under cont owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce particulate matter?  4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wiparticulate matter from stock piles?	airborne X Yes No ind entrainment of
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop po	
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)?	Yes No No No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		-
1. Date of last inspection: 2/7/2013  2. 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?  d. Date of last VE test: 2/7/2013  e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 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?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS 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	☐ 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</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
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
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?		pection.  No
f. What was the silo loading rate? ~200 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 go to	☐ Yes <i>h</i> .	⊠ No
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
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu 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 colle	ector	_
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?  2) What was the batching rate? ~200 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 6 minutes.	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>∑ Yes</li><li>∑ Yes</li></ul>	☐ No ☐ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? ~200 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No

### **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check <b>☑</b> onl	
		for each qu	estion)
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 general 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)?		<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
	45600 gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal prop		?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumers for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	mption X Yes	☐ No
_			
<u>G</u> I	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ onl for each qu	•
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?	$\nabla V_{ac}$	□ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	M 168	∐ No
3	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		☐ No
٥.	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	l	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both s	stationary and relocatable	(check <b>box</b> for each	•
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (I)		g question 2.)	
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.)		- Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or I e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific</li> </ul>	prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	ess days following a relocation? tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	- Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			☐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purl If YES, what was the purpose?	in that separate permit: pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage		☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANCES			
<u>CHANGES</u>		(check <b>✓</b> box for each	
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin	of the facility or any emissions un	its or	⊠ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:			☐ No
Since the last registration form submittal has there been     a. Installation of any new process equipment?     b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?     c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subst	antially different?		No No No No No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?  b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subst d. A change in ownership?	antially different?		⊠ No ⊠ No
Since the last registration form submittal has there been     a. Installation of any new process equipment?     b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?     c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subst	antially different? on form and the appropriate fee sub		<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ul> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ul>	antially different? on form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been <ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subst</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ul>	antially different?on form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been <ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substead. A change in ownership?</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ul>	on form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been <ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subst</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ul>	antially different? on form and the appropriate fee sub  5/28/2014  Date of Inspection	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No