

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>2/4/2014</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:00AM</u> DEPART:	9:40AM
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)422-376 Mobile: PHONE: (407)422-376	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPL	IANCE
DADT II. ONCUTE INTRODUCTODY MEETING	
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Adam Freeman Priof Notes:	(check ✓ only one box for each question)
Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Representative still ADAM FREEMAN*?	⊠ Yes □No
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still ADAM FREEMAN*? If no, who is?:	 ∑ Yes
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	∑ Yes

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-S silo(cement)w/two silotop dust collectors,125Ton subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 1/30/2013 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?	(check	only one question) No
PA	If not, what was the problem (if known)? ART II: STACK EMISSIONS 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?	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 loader. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	led during ins	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 28.55 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	Yes	⊠ No
	1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	☐ 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. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	tes 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 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 11 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?	X YesX Yes	☐ No☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 11 % 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? 28.55 tons/hour. 	⊠ Yes	☐ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/14/2013 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	
	N/A Yes No
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? 37.8 tons/hour	
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report swhether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	N/A Yes No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the las If not, what was the problem (if known)?	t VE test? Yes No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS 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 vis	it?
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute aver 	
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 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? 33.33 tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collif YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$	
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 duration?	Yes No
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 controlled.	llector which is separate
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? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 1	and duration? X Yes No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site via. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	isit?
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute ave c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? 33.33 tons/hour. 	

Emissions Unit Section

4 -CCB Plant-batcher w/emission water spray control subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 1/31/2012 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)?	X Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		
	(check ☑ box for each o	only one question)
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>		,
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control uncor emissions by:	ıfined	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of t		
paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?)	∐ No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the	🔀 Yes	∐ No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?		☐ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?		☐ No
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

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ✓	only one
		box for each	
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)?		☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	<u>nne/yr</u> ≤ 1.0 e/yr	0?
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
CI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ⊻ box for each	only one 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?		⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		□ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all		
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	<u> </u>	□ No
	permit and Department rules?	- ⊠ Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ only one	
1. Is the facility: stationary \(\subseteq \); relocatable \(\subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stational</i>)		
2. 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.)		
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Progenail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to chang b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [D 	ging location? Yes No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days follow c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DI	wing a relocation? Yes No EP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction		
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separat a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there If YES, what was the purpose?	te permit:	
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes No	
If 1 E.S, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		
CHANGES	(check ☑ only one	
	box for each question)	
Administrative Changes:		
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or a associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change.	y or any emissions units or	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility? Yes No	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change. 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative chan 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change. 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change. 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change. 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?	y or any emissions units or nge at the facility?	

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Bruno Ferraro, of Grove Scientific and Engineering Services, on February 4, 2014, at 6423 West Jones Ave, Zellwood, Florida 32798 to audit the visible emission test on four emission units. The emission units tested were EU001, EU003, and EU004. It should be noted that emission unit EU002 was not tested because it is in long term reserve shutdown. All emission units tested had an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates were acceptable. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM was observed leaving the property during the compliance test. The facility Plant Operator, Daniel McQuaig was present during the VE test. The facility appears to be in compliance during inspection performed on this date with the air permit.