

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN		INUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLA ARMS C		SCOVERY ( INT NO:	CI)		
ΑI	<b>RS ID#:</b> 0010119 <b>DATE:</b>	3/10/2014	ARRIVE:	<u>11:00</u>		DEPART: 1	11:30	
FA	CILITY NAME: NORTH	H GAINESVILLE READY-	MIX PLANT					
FA	CILITY LOCATION:	820 NW 53rd Ave						
		GAINESVILLE 32609	9-1015					
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZED R Email: sigurdm.bo@cem DNTACT NAME: SIG B Email: sigurdm.bo@cem TITLEMENT PERIOD:	SO ex.com	ВО	] ]	PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:			
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE								
PA	RT II: <u>ONSITE INTROI</u>	DUCTORY MEETING					(check ☑	only one
1.	Name(s) of facility represe	entative(s): Roger Young				1	oox for each o	•
	Brief Notes: Met on site v	with plant operator Roger Yo	oung.					
	Is the Authorized Represer If no, who is?:	ntative still SIG BO?					Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the facility Is the facility contact still S If no, who is?:	provide an administrative u SIG BO?	pdate within 3	0 days? -			Yes Yes	□No □No
		VE test(s) during today's ir authority notified at least 15					Yes Yes	⊠No □No

# Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-split No. silo (cement) compartment #1 w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 09/09/2012	(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		□ No □ No		
operation?	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? 26.46 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? N/A  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	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 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 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></ul>	Yes Yes	☐ No		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate				
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?	⊠ 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?  2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra	☐ Yes	⊠ No		
duration?  3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	- 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 es.	⊠ 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		
<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>	Yes	☐ No		

## **Facility Section (continued)**

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each				
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?		☐ 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.)?  If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No			
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene 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)?	- ⊠ Yes - ⊠ Yes - ⊠ Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>			
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.5 MM g	$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} \leq 1.00?$				
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consun for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption - 🛭 Yes	☐ No			
CENEDAL CONDITIONS	. [7]				
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	•			
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:  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					
terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- 🔀 Yes	☐ 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				
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?				
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.	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	ness days following a relocation? Yes No cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]			
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five.  3. 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 a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	it in that separate permit:			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?				
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
CHANGES	(check ☑ only one			
Administrative Changes:	box for each question)			
Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number o associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administration.	on of the facility or any emissions units or			
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day				
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?				
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? Yes X N c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? Yes X N				
d. A change in ownership?	Yes No			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registral 30 days prior to the change?	ion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes No			
Scott Johnston	3/10/2014			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	3/2019			

**COMMENTS:** Met operator Roger Young on site. Plant manager Jim Lane was out making a concrete delivery. All requested documentation was available for inspection. facility is regularly checking and maintaining pollution control equipment. Permit was remewed in 2013. Facility has not completed VE testing for calendar but is planning to do testing. Facility was operating during inspection and one truck was loaded with concrete. No visual emissions were seen during loading. Aggregate piles were being watered down with sprinklers and there was no excess fugitive emissions noted on site. Facility was very clean and organized and appears to be operating in compliance with permit requirements.