

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)			
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 0951262 DATE: 3/16/12 ARRIVE: 9:43 AM DEPART:	2:38 PM		
FACILITY NAME: FINFROCK/APOPKA FACILITY			
FACILITY NAME: FINFROCK/APOPKA FACILITY			
FACILITY LOCATION: 2400 APOPKA BLVD			
APOPKA 32703-7743			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DANIEL FINFROCK Email: Mobile: CONTACT NAME: Ralph Watty. Batch Plant Supervisor Email: rwatty@finfrockdmc.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/5/2008 / 3/5/2013 PHONE: Mobile: (407)293-4000 Mobile: (407)466-3632			
(effective date) (end date)			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
DADE HA ONGVER INTEROPLICATION APPENDIC			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Daniel Finfrock Doi: 6.00.4	(check ✓ only one box for each question)		
Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Representative still DANIEL FINFROCK? If no, who is?:	⊠ Yes □No		
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still?	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☑No		
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	YesNo YesNo		

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

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u> 1. Date of last inspection: <u>3/10/11</u> 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only obox for each question	
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		10 10
operation?d. Date of last VE test: 3/10/11	N/A ☐ Yes ☐ N	lo.
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days af f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 19.95 tons/hour	Yes N	10 10
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the rewhether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 	\square N/A \square Yes \square N	10 10
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the limit flow, what was the problem (if known)?	he last VE test? 🛛 Yes 🗌 N	Мо
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑ only o	one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question	on)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this si	te visit? 🖂 Yes 🗌 N	Vo
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 a		No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?		lo
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 loaded during inspection.		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practic f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.17</u> tons/hour		lo
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo du <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1$		Vo
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test	? Yes N	No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the n duration?	Yes N	Vo
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durah. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a du	ust collector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durati	rate and duration? Yes N	lo
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	site visit?	10 10
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 		Ло

Emissions Unit Section 2 -Concrete batch plant - silo 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only obox for each question	
1. Date of last inspection: 3/10/11	box for each question	011)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?d. Date of last VE test: 3/1/11	⊠ N/A □ Yes □ N	No
e. Was the VE test: 3/1/11 e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days aft f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 33.9 tons/hour		No No
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the rep whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 	N/A ☐ Yes ☐ N	No No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during th If not, what was the problem (if known)?	e last VE test? 🛛 Yes 🔲 N	No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	() . [7] ·	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ only o	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question	on)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this sit	e visit? 🖂 Yes 🔲 1	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 at c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? - If not, what was the problem (if known)? 		No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the load		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{No} \) \(\subseteq \text{N} \)		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice	e? 🗵 Yes 🔲 🛚	No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.24</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo due	st collector? Yes X	No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1$) 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the no	ormal batching rate and	
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching durati		No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dual		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching r 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration		No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this s.		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 a c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		No
d. What was the process rate? <u>25.64</u> tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 3 -Concrete batch plant - silo 3 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u> 1. Date of last inspection: <u>3/10/11</u> 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
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?d. Date of last VE test: 3/1/11	N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No	
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		
 h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the rep whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour 	⊠ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the If not, what was the problem (if known)?	e last VE test? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑ only one	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)	
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site	e visit?	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute as c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? - If not, what was the problem (if known)? 		
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? \(\sum \text{Yes} \) \(\sup \text{No} \) \(\sup \text{N/A} - \text{silo not loaded during inspection.} \)		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.64</u> tons/hour		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo due <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g.1) - g.3$) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> $g.1$)		
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 no duration?	Yes No	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duratih. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (tonducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching reconstruction). What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration	rate and duration? X Yes No	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this sia. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	ite visit?	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute a c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? - d. What was the process rate? <u>26.09</u> tons/hour. 		

Emissions Unit Section 4 -Weigh Hopper Dust Collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 3/10/11	(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? 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
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	X Yes	☐ 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?	Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A − silo not		
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		□ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? -		⊠ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and $g.1$) 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 batchin duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? n h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector w		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durat 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 3-4 minu	ion? 🛛 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?	X Yes	□ No□ 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? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 		□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		. 🎞	_
			neck 🗹 of for each o	
		UUX I	or each q	[uestion)
Ι.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:		Vac	□ No
	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?		Yes	∐ No □ No
	c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		Yes	☐ No
	v 100 tons per year or more or any outer regulated air portation.		100	
2.	Does this facility include:			
	a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception	of		
	units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or		**	
	Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	- Ш	Yes	⊠ No
	If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?			
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		Vac	⊠ No
	If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	Ш	1 68	M N0
	11 125, what other general permit units of activities.			
2	To the total combined convert facility and a fact access of all plants less than an arrest to.			
э.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?	\square	Ves	□ No
	b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?			☐ No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?			☐ No
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?			☐ No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	\boxtimes	Yes	☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propa	ane/vr	< 1.00?	,
	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propan			
4	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum	ntion		
••	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		Yes	☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		neck 🗹 o	•
		box f	for each q	(uestion)
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			S
2	devices?	📙	Yes	⊠ No
۷.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- 🛛	Yes	☐ 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
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access	š		
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	🖂	Ves	□ No
	permit and Department Tuies?	- 🖂	168	∐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹 only one		
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable box for each question)		
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i>)			
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ————————————————————————————————————			
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificent 	prior to changing location? Yes No		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ess days following a relocation? Yes No		
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 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 If YES, what was the purpose?			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes No		
CHANGES	(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
Administrative Changes:	•		
 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 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? Yes No New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been 			
a. Installation of any new process equipment? ————————————————————————————————————			
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrati 30 days prior to the change?			
Norma Ali	3/16/12		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	12/31/13		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		
COMMENTS: The inspector from OCEPD, Norma Ali, met with D Watty, Batch Plant Supervisor, to audit the Annual Visual Emission C The loading rates and opacity observed was as follows: EU001 - 25.17 tph - 0% opacity EU002 - 26.92 tph - 0% opacity EU003 - 26.09 tph - 0% opacity EU004 0% Opacity, the truck loading out takes about 3 to 4 min each	Compliance test on the four EU's.		
The facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.			