

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 0951228 DATE: <u>12/4/12</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:55 AM</u> DEPART:	1:35 PM			
FACILITY NAME: CCB PLANT & BLOCK PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION: 10500 Rocket Ct				
ORLANDO 32824-8567				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: LOU DEBERADINIS Email: CONTACT NAME: LOU DEBERADINIS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/8/2010 / 7/8/2015 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (407)859-13 Mobile: PHONE: (407)859-13 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	(1.17/			
Name(s) of facility representative(s): Pio Urso, Plant Manager	(check only one box for each question)			
Brief Notes:				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still LOU DEBERADINIS?	⊠ Yes □No			
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still LOU DEBERADINIS? If no, who is?:	YesNo YesNo			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?				

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-RMplant,silo#1(compart.#1&2)w/1silotop d-collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/21/11 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 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
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
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	 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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? $\frac{\sim 33}{\sim 31}$ 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?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	ites 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? minut		☐ 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? ~33 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 -CCB Plant-RMplant,flyash silo#1,w/1silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	only one
1.	Date of last inspection: $\underline{12/21/11}$	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?	☐ Yes	⊠ 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: <u>12/6/11</u>		
	e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Yes	☐ No
	f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	Yes	☐ No
	g. What was the actual silo loading rate? ~ 32.65 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)?		
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
			•
1	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ v _{os}	□ No
1.	·		
	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
	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? \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not load} \)		
	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? ~37.3 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		□ N7
	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 raturation?		☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		□ No
	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.		
			□ No
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		∐ No
2	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut		□ No
۷.	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
		Yes	∐ No
	b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Vas	□ No
	 c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 37.3 tons/hour. 	Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section <u>5 -CCB Plant-BlockPlant,silo#1(cement)w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/21/11 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?	☐ Yes	 No No No No No No
	 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 test? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 		⊠ 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
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	□ No
	 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. e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 37.2 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?		☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute. 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. 	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? minut		☐ 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? ~36 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-BlockPlant,silo#2(cement)w/silotop dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 12/21/11 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 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
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
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? ~42.9 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
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minuth. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	ites n is separate	☐ N0
	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? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut	? 🛛 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 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? ~40.26 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 8 –CCB Plant-BlockPlant mixer w/1 single bag filter subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
1. D	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: 12/21/11	1 /
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ Vas □ Na
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
	N/A Yes No
d. Date of last VE test: $\frac{12/21/11}{6}$	
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? tons/hour	
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report	
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?	
j. What was the actual batching rate? 2 tons/hour	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the las	st 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 ☑ only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)
	con for even question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site vis	sit?
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 avera	
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? Yes No 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? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust co	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.$	
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	al 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 co	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate a	
2) What was the batching rate? <u>2</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>60</u> m	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site v	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\frac{0}{0}$ % 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? 2 tons/hour.	

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		only one ich 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?	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 gener 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)?	X YesX YesX Yes	□ No□ No□ No□ No□ No	
	gal diesel/yr + 275,000 gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr+ 1.3 MM gal propare 1.3 MM gal propare	<u>ine/yr</u> < 1 e/yr	.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?	ption Yes	☐ No	
GI	GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ☑ only one box for each 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?	□ Yes	⊠ No	
2.	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	Yes	☐ No	
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	☐ No	
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No	

RI	ELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	•
1.	Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the followin</i>	box for each g 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(6	- Yes	☐ No
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	Yes	☐ No
3.	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: 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?		□ 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	☐ No
<u>C</u> 1	<u>HANGES</u>	(check ☑ box for each	
1. 2. <u>Ne</u>	 Mere 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 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?	itive not its or - Yes	⊠ No □ No
	a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?		NoNoNoNoNo
4.	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? ————————————————————————————————————	omitted 	☐ No
No	orma Ali 12/4/12		
	Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
	12/31/13		
	Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection	

COMMENTS: Norma Ali, OCEPD, met with Kent Bottorf, Consultant, and Pio Urso, Batch Plant Manager, on December 4, 2012, to audit the visible emissions test on:

EU001 Loading rate of ~33tph; EU003 Loading rate of ~37.3 tph; EU005 Loading rate of ~36 tph; EU006 loading rate of ~40.26 tph. Opacity observed on all five emission points was zero percent. EU008 was also tested, block plant mixer with a single bag filter. The facility was operating. The operating rate was approximately 2 tons per hour. Due to slow economy, three of the emission units were not tested this year.

No dust was observed leaving the property, no objectionable odors noted. The facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.