CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 7775121 DA	TE: <u>3/22/12</u>	ARRIVE: <u>11:20 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>12:58 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: EA	AST ORLANDO-ALAFAYA PLA	ANT	
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 4001 S ALAFAYA TR		
	ORLANDO 32831-200	9	
Email:	CD REPRESENTATIVE: THO ABNER FONTANEZ, PRODUCT OD: 7/9/2011 / 7/9/2016 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile:	(407)467-0637

Facility Section

PART I: <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (check ☑ only one box)

PA	ART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u>	(check 🗹	only one
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Abner Fontanez</u>	box for each	question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still THOMAS LANG?	Xes Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still THOMAS LANG?	YesYes	□No ⊠No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/22/12 2. Det Minister Filter (MED)	(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
 d. Date of last VE test: 3/22/11 	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? <u>28.4</u> 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? X N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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)? 	X 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
 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?	Xes 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?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34.2</u> tons/hourg. 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	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	ites	L 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 coll		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration2) 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?	🛛 Yes	□ No □ No
b. The visible emission test conducted according to ErA Method 9?		

2-CCB Plant-SW sile	(cement) w/silotop	baghouse sub	ject to 5%	Opacity Limit
---------------------	---------	-------------	--------------	------------	----------------------

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/22/12	(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 fort year of communication was a VE test performed within 20 days of communication 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 3/22/11 	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? <u>29.5</u> 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? X N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	D 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)?	Xes 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 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 average.	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-initial average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contract ∇A		
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?		No
 f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>28.2</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	h	
 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 	te and	∐ No
duration?	tes	🗌 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 colle		
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? minute		🗌 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?		□ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% 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? <u>27.69</u> tons/hour.		

4 -CCB Plant-NE silo	(cement) w/silotop	baghouse sub	ject to 5% (Opacity Limit
----------------------	---------	-------------	--------------	--------------	----------------------

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/22/11 2. Dart Visible Environment (VE) tester	(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? X/A d. Date of last VE test: 3/22/11	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? ~ 23.4 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test restated in an opticity of <u>o</u> // for the ingless six influe average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contrast 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? f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>34</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 $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to		No No
 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 	te and	∐ No
 duration?	tes	No No
 from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector which 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? <u>6</u> minutes. 	ector	🗌 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 ⊠ Yes	□ No □ 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

5 - CCB Plant-truck loadout w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Lim	nit
--	-----

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/22/11	(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?		□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 3/22/11 	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? tons/hour 		□ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	- 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
DADTH, STACK EMICSIONS from a sile serial honnou(hotohon) on other		
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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 c		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loaded. Was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
 f. What was the silo loading rate? 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	o h.	
 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 	ate and	∐ No
duration?		🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	ch is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co 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? minu	n? 🛛 Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	- 🛛 Yes	
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? 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? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	_	∐ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	
	(check $\mathbf{\nabla}$ only one box for each question)
	box for each 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
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the except units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	
 b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 	
 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 □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal pr275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal proj	
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel cons for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	

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?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary \Box ; relocatable \boxtimes ; or consisting of both s	stationary and relocatable	box for each	question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (g question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		—	
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		· 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
(<i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.</i>) a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or			
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day		Yes	🗌 No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific			_
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin			∐ No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			No No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate		nit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit		$\mathcal{O} \square \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{r}}$	
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?	pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)		∐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it	was		
co-located at the permitted facility?		- 🗌 Yes	No No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		· 🗌 Yes	∐ No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of	the facility or authorized representation	tive not	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation			
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admi			🛛 No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? Yes			No No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:			
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?			\bowtie No
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?		- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
d. A change in ownership?		- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
4. If the answer to any question $3a - d$. is YES, was a new registration	on form and the appropriate fee sub	mitted	
30 days prior to the change?			🗌 No
Norma Ali	3/22/12		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/31/2013		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Insp	pection	
COMMENTS: The OCEPD inspector, Norma Ali, met with Mr. Abi Arlington, to audit the annual visual emissions compliance test. The results are as follows:	ner Fontanez, Plant representative, a	nd Kaye and	Bill

EU001 Loading rate= 32.7 tph Opacity observed = 0%EU004 Loading rate= 33.2 tph Opacity observed = 0%observed, due to slow business.

EU002 Loading rate= 27.69 tph Opacity observed = 0% EU005 Truck load out Opacity observed = 0% 6 min, one truck

Yard is paved, sprinklers on on aggregate piles. Facility appeared in compliance at the time of inspection.