

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)						
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 0951262 DATE: <u>3/10/2011</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:45 AM</u> DEPART: <u>10:45 AM</u>						
FACILITY NAME: FINFROCK/APOPKA FACILITY						
FACILITY LOCATION: 2400 APOPKA BLVD						
APOPKA 32703-7743						
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DANIEL FINFROCK Email: CONTACT NAME: Trisha Vargas Email: TVargas@finfrock.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/5/2008 / 3/5/2013 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (407)293-40 Mobile: PHONE: (407)293-40 Mobile:						
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): Trisha Vargas Brief Notes:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still DANIEL FINFROCK?	⊠ Yes □No					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still? If no, who is?:	-					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 1 -Concrete batch plant - silo 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one	
	Date of last inspection: $\frac{4/8/2010}{}$	JOA TOI CACII	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? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 4/8/2010	☐ 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? 32.56 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	
DA	RT II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_	
FA	enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check	only one	
	cherosed 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 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? \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?			
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 20 tons/hour	- <u> </u>	⊠ 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 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? 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 coll conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	? Xes	☐ No	
	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut			
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? 		□ No	
	d. What was the process rate? 20 tons/hour.	<u> </u>	☐ 140	

Facility Section (continued)

_			
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		only one ch 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 ☐ Yes	NoNoNoNo
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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of gal diesel/yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of g	ne/yr	00? ⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		only one ch 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:	<u> </u>	
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- 🖂 Yes	∐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	Yes	☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ only one			
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			
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif 	y prior to changing location? Yes No			
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five bust c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]			
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fi				
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, 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)? Yes No				
If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long				
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, 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 authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes No 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?				
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	t? Yes No No stantially different? Yes No			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?	tion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes No			
Ilka Bundy	3/10/2011			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)				
F	Date of Inspection			
	Date of Inspection 3/1/2012			

COMMENTS: Ilka Bundy audited the visible emissions test on the cement silo #1, EU001. This emission unit could not be tested on 3/1/2011 due to the silo being full of product. No batching occurred during today's test. Batching was observed by another inspector on 3/1/2011. The loading rate was 20 TPH, which is less than the permitted rate of 25 TPH. The consultant, Bruno Ferraro of Grove Scientific, stated that the facility's new policy only allows tankers to pump at 8 psi. Since the silos are so tall, the 25 TPH requirement is not achievable in practice for this site. The sprinklers were on at the aggregate piles. The aggregates have wind breaks. The facility uses a dust suppressant to control emissions from the yard. The observed opacity for this EU was 0%. No objectionable odors were detected. No uncontrolled or unconfined emissions were observed. The facility appears to be in compliance with their air permit requirements at this time.