

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/D  ARMS COMPLA	ISCOVERY (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 1150106 DATE: <u>11/21/12</u>	ARRIVE: <u>08:10</u>	DEPART:	9:20	
FACILITY NAME: VENICE READY-MIX CONC	CRETE (RMC) PLANT			
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 515 GENE GREEN	N RD			
VENICE 34275-3	3604			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: kfolsom@titanamerica.com CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/6/2011 / 8/6/20 (effective date) (end date)	016	PHONE: (954)242-018 Mobile: (954)242-018 PHONE: Mobile:		
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):  Brief Notes:	<u>3</u>		(check <b>☑</b> box for each	only one n question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still KELLY FO If no, who is?:	LSOM*?		☐ Yes	⊠No
If different, did the facility provide an administrat  3. Is the facility contact still? If no, who is?:	ive update within 30 days?		Yes Yes	□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda. If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			Yes Yes	□No □No

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/11/09 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No
	<ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? 40 tons/hour</li> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ 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
	<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
	<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 loader. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25</u> 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		⊠ No
	<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate</li> </ol>		∐ No
	duration?		☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour . What was the batching duration?minutes h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	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		☐ No
	2) What was the batching rate? 40 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 16 minutes.	_	
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
	<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? 25 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 12/11/09 2. Date of last inspection: (4/5)	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
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	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
operation? 🔯 N/A	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? 26 tons/hour	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	⊠ 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? 40 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: 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</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 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?</li></ul>	led during insp	
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26</u> tons/hour		⊠ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  If YES, then continue on to questions $g.11 - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.11 - g.3$ ) and go to	_	
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra</li> </ol>		∐ No
duration?  3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes  h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		□ No
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? 40 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 16 minutes.		☐ 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? 26 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No

# Emissions Unit Section 3 -CCB Plant-truck loadout w/stand-alone central dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	•
Date of last inspection: 12/11/09     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?   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		
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unco emissions by:</li> </ol>	nfined	
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li></ul>	o Yes	□ No
particulate matter?	of —	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	X Yes	☐ 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)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper/scale w/baghouse filter vent subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		
1.	Date of last inspection: 12/11/09 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?	<ul> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	No No No No No No
	k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	⊠ Yes	∐ No
	If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
D 4	DT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a cile projek kommer/ketaken) en etken		
P P	ART 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 collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo collector.		
	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?		spection.
	f. What was the silo loading rate?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 $g.1$	∐ Yes h.	⊠ 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 rat duration?		☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration?minut		
	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.		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?  2) What was the batching rate? 40 tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 16 minutes.	Yes	☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

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

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 or for each qu	
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.)?  If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air ger 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?		<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 propagation of the second secon		)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumor for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ımption X Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> on for each qu	
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
Does the owner or operator:     a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?     b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	X Yes	☐ No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		☐ No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	.1	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary	ationary and relocatable	(check 🗹 o	-
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)			
<ul> <li>2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ul>		Yes	☐ No
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	rior to changing location?	Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busines c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat	s days following a relocation? ion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five by 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air			∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose?  b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was the purpose.	n that separate permit: ose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)?		□ No
co-located at the permitted facility?			☐ No ☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	b	(check 🗹 o	
Administrative Changes:  1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin  2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days on New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	of the facility or any emissions units istrative change at the facility?	or Yes	⊠ No □ No
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? - c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substa d. A change in ownership?	ntially different?		<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		itted Yes	☐ No
//s//Michael Storino	11/21/12		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	_	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspe	ection	

**COMMENTS:** MS conducted an INS3, no compliance issues were observed. Supervisor stated facility does not utilize a water truck or sweeping to control buildup of material on the paved surfaces. MS cautioned facility that while no VE were observed emminating from the facility during the inspection that additional steps must be taken if fugitive emissions are observed from the yard.