	WEITUL PROTECTION	
NG.BI	1 Car	
E FI	ORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [ RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [	COMPLAINT/D	DISCOVERY (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 1010488 DA	TE: <u>1-24-12</u>	ARRIVE: <u>8:45</u>	DEPART	: <u>9:45</u>	
FACILITY NAME: SA	N ANTONIO				
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 11803 Uradco Place				
	SAN ANTONIO 3	3576			
Email: hugh_perry@	ATHERINE CHUMLEY larock.com	2	PHONE: (904)355-17 Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	'81	
Facility Section					
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE         SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
	<b>RODUCTORY MEETING</b> presentative(s): <u>Mr. Eddie M</u>			(check 🗹 box for each	•
Brief Notes: <u>Facility</u>	Operations Manager				
2. Is the Authorized Rep If no, who is?:	resentative still HUGH PERR	XY?		🛛 Yes	No
	cility provide an administrativ still KATHERINE CHUMLE -				□No □No
4. Will facility be condu If yes, was the compli	cting VE test(s) during today' ance authority notified at leas	's inspection?		🗌 Yes - 🗌 Yes	□No □No

## **Emissions Unit Section** 1 –CONCRETE BATCH PLANT WITH CENTRAL BAGHOUSE SYSTEM subject to 5% Opacity Limit

	, c pac., =	
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>		only one question)
1. Date of last inspection: $1-26-11$		1
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	<u> </u>	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes	
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? X N/A	Yes	🗌 No
d. Date of last VE test: 1-26-11		
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? $\underline{\sim 25}$ tons/hour	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>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</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>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)?</li></ul>	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	( 1 1. <b> 7</b>	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each o	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes Yes	No No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>		□ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo con		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\bigotimes$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not load		
<ul> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li> <li>f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>~25</u> tons/hour</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes	No 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	$\bowtie$ Yes $h$ .	🗌 No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?</li></ul>	$\boxtimes$ Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? <u>?</u> tons/hour . What was the batching duration? <u>5-10</u> minutes</li> <li>h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which</li> </ul>		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector 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	Yes	🗌 No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes	No No
<ul><li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li><li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li></ul>	Yes	∐ No
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	- 🗌 Yes	× No × No × No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li></ul>	- 🛛 Yes - 🖾 Yes - 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
$\frac{0 \text{ gal diesel/yr} + 0 \text{ gal gasoline/yr} + 0 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr} + 0 \text{ MM gal propane/yr} \le 1.00?}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr} 23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr} 44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr} 1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}}$	ne/yr	
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?		🗌 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
2. Does the owner or operator:		
<ul><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	· 🛛 Yes	L No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		No 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

<b>RELOCATABLE PLANT:</b> 1. Is the facility: stationary 🖂; relocatable ]; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable ]	(check 🗹 box for each	question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	ng question 2.)	
<ul> <li>2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone,</li> <li>e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900]</li> </ul>		🗌 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?		🗌 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: <ul> <li>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?</li> </ul>		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?		D No No
CHANGES	(check 🗹 box for each	•
Administrative Changes:		question
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 u		
<ul> <li>operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If YES did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	No No

2.	If TES, did the identity provide written notified for writing 50 days of the change.	L 105	
Ne	ew 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?	Yes	🛛 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 form and the appropriate fee subn	nitted	
	30 days prior to the change?	☐ Yes	□ No

Mr. Chris Haines

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Chin Hatr

1-24-12

Date of Inspection

1-24-15

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** I (Chris Haines) arrived at the facility in order to witness the facility's annual Visible Emissions Test, conducted by Mr. Kevett Mickle of Grove Scientific and Engineering. I first met with Mr. Mickle and Mr. Eddie Marroquin to give let them know that I had arrived early and that we could proceed with the test. We alerted the truck driver and he set up his hoses to load the silos. The test started at approximately 9:00AM and lasted 30 minutes. Mr. Mickle saw the test through to the end of the unloading process (after I had left). I performed the remainder of my inspection and asked Mr. Marroquin for the facility's throughput records. He told me that I would have to contact Ms. Lori Tilley to get those. Today (1-25-12) I emailed Ms. Katherine Chumley for

permission to contact the contractor since this may incur a charge. When I receive the records I will append them to the electronic file. I concluded my inspection with Mr. Marroquin at approximately 9:45AM.