	WEITUL PROTECTION	
NG.BI	1 Car	
E FI	ORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)			ί (CI)
AIRS ID#: 0951228 DA FACILITY NAME: Bee	ATE: <u>12/21/2011</u> edrock Industries, Inc. CCB P	ARRIVE: <u>9:49 AN</u> PLANT & BLOCK PLANT		DEPART: <u>11:03 AM</u>
	N: 10500 ROCKET BL ORLANDO 32824 ED REPRESENTATIVE: 1	24		(407)859-1300
Email: CONTACT NAME: L Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC			Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(407)859-1300
Facility Section				
	N COMPLIANCE STATUS	\underline{JS} (check $\underline{\square}$ only one box)		

IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s): Pio Urso	(check 🗹 box for each	2
	Brief Notes: <u>Ready-mix manager</u>		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still LOU DEBERADINIS?	X Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still LOU DEBERADINIS? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No ⊠No

Emissions Unit Section

|--|

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: <u>12/6/2011</u>	box for each	question)
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?	\square Yes	\square No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
operation? X/N/A	Yes	No No
d. Date of last VE test: $8/26/2010$		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		No No
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? 🛛 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 last VE test?	🛛 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 🗹	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?	Xes	🗌 No
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?	🛛 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?	🛛 Yes	No No
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 co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \boxtimes N/A – silo not load		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	L Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		
		\bigtriangledown No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? If VES, then continue on to questions a_1 , a_3 below. If answer NO, then skip a_1 , a_3 and a_2 to	\square 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	h	
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?	h. TYes	🛛 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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate 	h. Yes te and	D 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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration? 	<i>h</i> . Yes te and Yes	
 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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	h. Yes te and Yes tes	D 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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	h. Yes te and Yes tes n is separate	D 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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	h. Yes te and Yes tes is separate ector	□ 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minut 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? 	h. Yes te and Yes tes is separate ector	D 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu 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 mormal batching rate and duration? What was the batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>60</u> minutes. 	h. $ Yes$ $te and$ $ Yes$ tes $h is separate$ $ector$ $ Yes$ $ Yes$	 No No 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu 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 normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>60</u> minutes. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 	$h.$ $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	□ No □ 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu 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 mormal batching rate and duration? What was the batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>60</u> minutes. 	$h.$ $ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	 No No No No 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? 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 normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>60</u> minutes. 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?	h. Yes te and Yes tes is separate ector Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No 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 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration? What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? 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 normal batching rate and duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? What was the batching rate? <u>1</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 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? The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% for the highest six-minute average. 	h. Yes te and Yes tes is separate ector Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(.11 7	
	box for each	only one
		i question)
 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 gen permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 		🛛 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 🖾 Yes	 □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal pro275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal prop		0?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consu for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(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?	🗌 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 terms and conditions of the air general permit? 3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access 		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [X]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable []	(check ☑ box for each	•
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	ng question 2.))
 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(🗌 Yes	🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	Ves	🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pe and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:	rmit,	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usag If YES, what was the purpose?	e)? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🗌 Yes	D No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes:	box for each	•
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each ative not nits or 	•
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions up operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions up operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions upoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions upoperations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	box for each ative not nits or Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	question)

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

12/31/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Ilka Bundy, OCEPD, met with Kent Bottorf, Consultant, and Pio Urso, batch plant manager, on December 21, 2011, to audit the visible emissions test on EU008, block plant mixer with a single bag filter. The facility was operating and was manufacturing pavers. The operating rate was approximately 2000 lbs/hr, or 1 ton/hour. The facility previously had tested all other active emission units on December 9, 2011. The weigh hopper for the block plant was running during the last inspection, but was not producing any blocks. The consultant requested a 15-day waiver so that this EU could be retested before the end of the year. Ilka Bundy, Environmental Team Leader, waived the 15-day notice. Four of the emission units were not tested this year. A letter will be sent to OCEPD by the responsible official stating that the four emission units that were not tested in 2010 and 2011 were not used due to the slow economy. This facility added the block plant in 2010 and was issued a new general permit on July 8, 2010.