

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE	RY (CI)	
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO):	
TE: <u>8/7/2009</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:15 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:15 AM</u>	
CORD INDUSTRIES			
4001 FORSYTH RD			
WINTER PARK 3279)2		
REPRESENTATIVE:	PHONI	E: (407)671-5200	
les Zeman	PHONI	E: 4076715500	
PD: 8/16/2004 / 8/16/2009 (effective date) (end date))		
			1
COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	heck o nly one box)		
E MINOR Non-COMP	PLIANCE SIGNIFICAL	NT Non-COMPLIANCE	
CORDKEEPING REQUIREM box(es))	MENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.	A.C.	
a silos, weigh hoppers (batchers tent necessary to limit visible essions tests of the silo dust colle resentative of the normal silo locunachievable in practice?	s), and other enclosed storage a emissions to 5 percent opacity? ector exhaust points was the loading rate, or at least at the mire peration controlled by the silo ditions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If any other wisible emissions test?	nd conveying equipment	No No No No
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI) TE: 8/7/2009 CORD INDUSTRIES 4001 FORSYTH RD WINTER PARK 3279 PREPRESENTATIVE: les Zeman D: 8/16/2004 / 8/16/2009 (effective date) (end date) COMPLIANCE STATUS (clean of the decision stests conducted during this essions tests of the silo dust colleges that the weigh hopper (batcher) of the weigh hopper (batcher) open of the weigh h	ARRIVE: 9:15 AM CORD INDUSTRIES 4001 FORSYTH RD WINTER PARK 32792 PREPRESENTATIVE: PHONI D: 8/16/2004 / 8/16/2009 (effective date) (end date) COMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box) E MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICATE CORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, For box(es)) constests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Moni silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage a tent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity? sisting tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the lost essentiative of the normal silo loading rate, or at least at the min unachievable in practice?————————————————————————————————————	RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO: TE: 8/7/2009 ARRIVE: 9:15 AM DEPART: 11:15 AM CORD INDUSTRIES 4001 FORSYTH RD WINTER PARK 32792 PREPRESENTATIVE: PHONE: (407)671-5200 D: 8/16/2004 / 8/16/2009 (effective date) (end date) COMPLIANCE STATUS (check of only one box) E MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE CORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. box(es)) Tools tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – 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 the annual 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 to 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))	
	e 🗌
 (check appropriate box(es)) 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>) 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.)	ing
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 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>) 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.)————————————————————————————————————	ing ☐Yes ⊠ No ☐Yes ☐ No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)				
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))				
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)				
 Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take emissions by: 	e reasonable precautions to control unconfined			
 a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and ya 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, sto 	ck piles, and yards? 🖂 🖰 📉	ing: Yes □ No		
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?				
 3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wing particulate matter from stock piles? 	reduce airborne particulate matter? d breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of			
particulate matter from stock piles?				
, ,,				
PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – F A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>	Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.			
Since the last inspection has there been				
a) installation of any new process equipment?				
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?				
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?				
d) If you answered YES to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete				
notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050 local program office?		Yes		
Bill Rhodes	8/7/2009			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	8/7/2010			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			

COMMENTS: Observed opacity for both baghouses on the silo was 0%. Loading trate was 26.58 tons per hour, which is acceptable. New bags were installed, as well as new seals, and a new floor in the baghouses during a two week shutdown for maintenance purposes. No objectionable odors or dust was observed during the VE test.