WHERE PROTECTION	
Some Carte	
FLORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (IN RE-INSPECTI		LAINT/DISCOVERY COMPLAINT NO:	й (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 7775190 DATE: 10/29/2010	ARRIVE:	: <u>10:48am</u>	DEPART: <u>12:31pm</u>	
FACILITY NAME: HOMOSASSA CO	NCRETE BATCH PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 8778 SC	DUTH JUMP CT			
НОМО	SASSA 34448			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENT Email: CONTACT NAME: WALLACE HINI Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/6/2008 (effective dat	DALONG / 1/6/2013	Mobile:	HONE: (352)621-3900 (352)621-3900	
Facility Section				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)         ☑ IN COMPLIANCE       ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE         ☑ IN COMPLIANCE       ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY	MEETING			
<ol> <li>Name(s) of facility representative(s):</li> <li>Brief Notes:</li> </ol>			(check ☑ box for each	
<ol> <li>Is the Authorized Representative still V If no, who is?:</li> </ol>	WALLACE HINDALONG?		Xes	DNo
If different, did the facility provide an 3. Is the facility contact still WALLACE If no, who is?:	administrative update within HINDALONG?	30 days?	Yes Yes	□No □No
<ol> <li>Will facility be conducting VE test(s) of If yes, was the compliance authority no</li> </ol>	luring today's inspection? otified at least 15 days in adva	ance?	Yes Yes	⊠No □No

## Emissions Unit Section <u>1 – CEMENT SILO 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       12/12/2010	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If first year of operation, year a VE test performed within 20 days of commencing.</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 10/6/2009</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul><li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li><li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li><li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>29.89</u> tons/hour</li></ul>	$\boxtimes$ Yes $\boxtimes$ 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? X/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	(alta alta 🗹	
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
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	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? 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? tons/hour 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	$\square$ 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>	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	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? minute	? 🗌 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 ☐ Yes	⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>		□ No

## Emissions Unit Section 2 –Fly Ash SILO 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       12/12/2007	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 10/09/2009</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul><li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li><li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li><li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>37.81</u> tons/hour</li></ul>	⊠ 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? X/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	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	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		1
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
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	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? 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? tons/hour 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	🗌 No
<ul> <li>2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?</li></ul>	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	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? minute	? 🗌 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
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	_	□ No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one
	box for each question)
<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>	Xes No - Yes 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>	
<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></ul>	
<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> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa	
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consume 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
<ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access</li> </ul>		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	box fo	eck 🗹 only one
1. Is the facility: stationary □; relocatable ⊠; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?	i stationary and relocatable	
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>	<sup>(</sup>	Yes 🛛 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department of e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif</li> </ul>	y prior to changing location?	Yes 🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busi c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes 🗌 No Yes 🗌 No
<ol> <li>If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un</li> </ol>	e air construction or air operation permit, it in that separate permit:	
<ul><li>a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pull If YES, what was the purpose?</li><li>b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long</li></ul>		Yes 🛛 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	🕅 `	Yes Do Yes No
L		
CHANGES		eck 🗹 only one
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number o		or each question)
<ul> <li>associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ul>	on of the facility or any emissions units or ninistrative change at the facility?	_
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		
<ul> <li>a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub</li> <li>d. A change in ownership?</li> </ul>	t? logically different?	Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No Yes ⊠ No
<ol> <li>If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?</li> </ol>		Yes 🗌 No
Malik Pickering	10/29/2010	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	10/29/2013	

**COMMENTS:** Boxes that are blank are not applicable. During this inspection I saw a truck getting a batch load from the silos when I drove up to the facility. I observed it for about 10 minutes before I went into the office. I didn't see any visible emissions during this loadout. I met with Sharon McCray, who is the office administrator. I was told that Wallace Hindalong was at the hospital at the time due to an injury of an employee from and accident that has occurred earlier that morning. I asked Sharon for the ready mix plant's maintenance records. During my review of them I noticed that there was nothing in there for the month of September. So I asked about it and was told that they didn't operate at all in September. I talked to Ken, (which is that facility's maintenance person) during my walkthrough of the batch plant and I asked him several questions from the inspection checklist. When I was leaving, Mr. Hindalong showed up and I talked to him about the inspection and reminded him that they need to get their

VE testing done before the end of the year. Mr. Hindalong said that he hadn't heard from Koogler about it yet so he will call them about it very soon. I said ok and then headed back to the office.