

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	YERY (CI)	
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT N	IO:	
AIRS ID#: 0710219 DATE: <u>11/8/11</u>	ARRIVE: 8am	DEPART: 10 am	
FACILITY NAME: HANSON HARDSCAPE PRO	DUCTS-LEHIGH ACRES		
FACILITY LOCATION: 421 LEONARD BL	VD N		
LEHIGH ACRES	33971-6302		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: paul.carpenter@hanson.com CONTACT NAME: CHRIS LAWHON Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 4/7/2011 / 4/7/201 (effective date) (end date)	Mobil PHON Mobil	NE: (239)931-7663	
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still PAUL CARI If no, who is?:	PENTER?	X YesNo	
If different, did the facility provide an administrati 3. Is the facility contact still CHRIS LAWHON? If no, who is?:			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today If yes, was the compliance authority notified at lea			

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-plant#2E,splitsilo(whitecement)50Tw/silotopbaghous subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 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?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing 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? tons/hour	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ 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	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% 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 loading rate?	ded during ins	pection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	- L Yes	∐ 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 h.	☐ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ No
duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes.	- 🗌 Yes	☐ No
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.	h 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	? 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % 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? tons/hour.	Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-plant#1East,silo(graycement)50Tw/silotopbaghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/8/10 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 ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
	i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 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)?		□ 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</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. 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 collected and the silo dust collected which is a state of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collected which is a state of the weigh hopper (batcher	n is separate ector	□ Na
	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?		☐ No☐ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % 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? tons/hour. 		□ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-plant#1Centersilo(whitecement)50Tw/silotopbaghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 11/9/10 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ box for each ☐ Yes	only one question) No No No No No No No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 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	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % 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 co that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not loade. 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? 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?	h	□ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra		
duration?	tes n is separate	□ No
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	Yes Yes	☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute 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
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	∐ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section <u>5 -CCB Plant-plant#1Wsilo(cementsupplement)50Twsilotopb-house subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

1.	Date of last inspection: 11/9/10 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		⊠ 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</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	
	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?	h.	□ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching ra	te and	
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu	ites	☐ No
	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.		
	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	? 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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % 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? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-tumbler w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
	Date of last inspection: $\underline{11/9/10}$	box for each	question)
2.	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	∑ Yes	∐ No
	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? ————————————————————————————————————	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? <u>0</u> tons/hour	✓ Yes✓ Yes	☐ 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
DA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
FA	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑	only one
	enciosed 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</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 co		
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour		NO
	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 raduration?	- Yes	⊠ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		
	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.		
	conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	? Yes	⊠ No
2	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		⊠ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		⊠ No
	 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? 	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check	only one
			ach question)
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
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 general 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 ⊠ No
4	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the street of the stree	ne/yr	1.00?
	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		only one ach 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?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- Yes	⊠ No
3.	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?		⊠ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □	(check ☑ box for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	g question 2.)	
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	- Yes	⊠ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] 		☐ 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(6	-	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? - 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per		∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage If YES, what was the purpose?		☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?		☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	tive not its or - \(\sum \) Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership?		⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
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? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? d. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change?	Yes Yes Yes Yes mitted Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No