

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVE	ERY (CI)					
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO	O:					
AIRS ID#: 0951262 DATE: <u>5/1/2013</u> ARRIVE: <u>7:10</u>	DEPART: <u>12:30</u>					
FACILITY NAME: FINFROCK/APOPKA FACILITY						
FACILITY LOCATION: 2400 Apopka Blvd						
APOPKA 32703-7743						
Email: tvargas@finfrock.com Mobile	E: (407)367-2424					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING						
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>TRISHA VARGAS</u>	(check ✓ only one box for each question)					
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still TRISHA VARGAS?						
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still TRISHA VARGAS?						
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 1 -Concrete batch plant - northern silo 1 (Flyash) subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check boy for ea	only one ch question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{3/16/2012}{}$	box for ea	en question,
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: 3/16/2012	⊠ N/A	☐ 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?		☐ 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	□ No ⊠ 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	-	7
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check	-
cherosed storage and conveying equipment	box for ea	ch question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site	e visit? 🖂 Yes	☐ No
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute as 		☐ No
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? \(\subseteq \text{ Yes} \) No \(\subseteq \text{ N}\) e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice		nspection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? 25.49 tons/hour	. 2 103	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dus <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1$)		⊠ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	☐ No
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 duration of the state of th		
h. 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 (batcher)		,
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching ra	ate and duration? Yes	⊠ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duratio2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this si		☐ 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 <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? - 	<u> </u>	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? <u>25.49</u> tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 2 - Concrete batch plant - Center silo 2 (White) subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Data of last inspection: 3/16/2012	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 3/16/2012 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? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 3/16/2012	☐ 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?		☐ 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)?	? X 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?	X Yes	☐ No
 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average. 	X Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X 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	loaded during ins	spection.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? 21.31 tons/hour		⊠ 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 $g.3$		⊠ No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batchin 		☐ No
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? n	Yes	☐ No
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	hich is separate	
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? mi	ion?	⊠ 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 0.0 % for the highest six-minute average.	X Yes	☐ No☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? 21.31 tons/hour.	Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
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 ☐ 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.)?		⊠ No
	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?		⊠ 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?	X YesX Yes	☐ No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared	$\frac{\text{nne/yr}}{\text{e/yr}} \le 1.0$	0?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ption Yes	☐ No
CI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		
01	EVENAL CONDITIONS	(check v 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
2.	Does the owner or operator:		
	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		∐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (A	stationary and relocatable	(check v box for each 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 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 to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]		□ No
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 unit	in that separate permit:		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it	was		∐ No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		☐ Yes ☐ Yes	∐ No □ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:		(check ☑ box for each	•
<u>nammonanye Changes</u> .			- I
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	n of the facility or any emissions unit inistrative change at the facility?	s or Yes	⊠ No □ No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days	n of the facility or any emissions unit inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	s or Yes Yes Yes Yes	=
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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?	n of the facility or any emissions unit	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNo
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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 c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	n of the facility or any emissions unit inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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 c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	n of the facility or any emissions unit	Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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 c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs d. A change in ownership?	n of the facility or any emissions unit inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocatio operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days 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?	n of the facility or any emissions unit inistrative change at the facility? of the change?	Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No □ No

COMMENTS: Inspector, Assefa Hailemariam, met Dart Morales, consultant from Grove Scientific and Engineering, on May1 ,2013 to audit the compliance test being conducted on EU001and EU002. The observed opacity was 0.0% and the loading rate for EU001 was 25.49 tons/hour and the loading rate for Eu002 was 21.31tons/hour which is less than the minimum loading rate of 25tons/hour. This appears to be their normal loading rate. Facility yard is very wet and no PM was observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors were detected during the compliance test. The facility Plant Manager, Ralph Watty was present during the VE test.