

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)]					
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 0951244 DATE: <u>3/14/2013</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:10am</u> DEPA	RT: <u>9:30am</u>					
FACILITY NAME: A-1 BLOCK-ZELLWOOD						
FACILITY LOCATION: 6423 W JONES AVE						
ZELLWOOD 32798						
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ADAM FREEMAN* Email: adam@alblock.com CONTACT NAME: ADAM FREEMAN* Email: adam@alblock.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/7/2011 / 7/7/2016 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (407)422 Mobile: PHONE: (407)422 Mobile:						
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
DADT II. ONCUTE INTRODUCTORY MEETING						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Adam Freeman	(check ☑ only one box for each question)					
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ADAM FREEMAN*?	X YesNo					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still ADAM FREEMAN*?						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 3 -CCB Plant-N silo(flyash)w/silotop dust collector,50Ton subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 1/31/2012 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
	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>0.0</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	
	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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	- Yes	☐ 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 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 0.0 % 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? 37.80 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT	Γ ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ box for each	
b. 25 tons per year or more of any combinat	t it does not have the potential to emit: as air pollutant? tion of hazardous air pollutants? gulated air pollutant?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
units and activities that are exempt from per	ered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception ermitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or		⊠ No
	zed by another air general permit where such other air general low the use of one another at the same facility?its or activities?		⊠ No
b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?	gas? tiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?		NoNoNoNoNoNo
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/ 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, availabed for each consecutive 12-period for the past	ble for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum 5 years?	nption - X Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS			
GENERAL CUNDITIONS		(check ☑ box for each	
the emission of air pollutants without the pr devices?	umvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed roper operation of all applicable air pollution control	Yes	⊠ No
	condition?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
terms and conditions of the air general pern	ibility to use the air general permit and complies with all mit?	🛛 Yes	☐ No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect	the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces t and test and to determine compliance with the air general		☐ No

1/1	ELOCATABLE PLANT:		(che	ck 🗹 o	only one
	. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both station concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only</i>			•	uestion)
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		□ Y	es .	☐ No
	 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification 	to changing location?	_	?es	☐ No
	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business da c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification I	ys following a relocation? Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] _ Y		□ No
	to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five busin	ess days prior to relocation? -	🗌 Y	es es	☐ No
3.	. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air cor and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in tha		nit,		
	a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (If YES, what was the purpose?	i.e, there is no repeated usage)	? 🗌 Y	/es	☐ No
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?		- 🗆 Y	es .	□ No
	If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		Y	es es	☐ No
CH	<u>CHANGES</u>				only one
Δd			1 C-	1	
	dministrative Changes:			r each q	uestion)
1.	. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fac		ive not	r each q	(uestion)
1.		e facility or any emissions uni	ive not ts or	r each q Yes	uestion)
 2. 	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administration. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility?	ive not ts or	•	
1. 2. <u>Ne</u>	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility?	ive not ts or	Zes -	⊠ No
1. 2. <u>Ne</u>	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility?change?	ive not ts or \ Y	es es	⊠ No □ No
1. 2. <u>Ne</u> 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility?change?	ive not ts or Y	Zes -	⊠ No
1. 2. <u>Ne</u> 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fact associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantial	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	/es /es	⊠ No □ No
1. 2. <u>Ne</u> 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fact associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	/es /es /es /es	NoNoNoNoNoNo
1. 2. <u>Ne</u> 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fact associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantial	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	Zes Zes Zes Zes	No No No No No No No No No
1. 2. <u>Ne</u> 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No
1. 2. Ne 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the factor associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No
1. 2. Ne 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fac associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the few or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No
1. 2. Ne 3.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the fac associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrate. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the lew or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	e facility or any emissions unitive change at the facility? change?	ive not ts or Y	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: The inspector, Assefa Hailemariam, met Bruno Ferraro, consultant from Grove Scientific and Engineering, on March 14,2013 to audit the compliance test being conducted on the silo Eu003. The observed opacity was 0.0% and the loading rate was 37.80 tons/hour. Facility yard is dry and no PM was observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors were detected during the compliance test. The facility Plant Manager, James Timmons was present during the VE test.