CHARDER NOTECTION	
Some Manual	
FLORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 0951267 DATE: <u>2/2/11</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:20 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>10:15 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: S&L MATERIALS			
FACILITY LOCATION: 28001 SR 520			
CHRISTMAS 32709	9-8681		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: TA Email: CONTACT NAME: COREY MEYERS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/3/2007 / 3/3/2012	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(407)870-0066 (407)568-3709	
(effective date) (end date)			
Facility Section			
PART I:       INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COM	· · ·	Γ Non-COMPLIANCE	
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING         1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Tama Davis, T         Brief Notes:	<u>`reasurer</u>	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)	
<ol> <li>Is the Authorized Representative still TAMA DAVIS If no, who is?:</li> </ol>	<b>3</b> ?	XesNo	
If different, did the facility provide an administrative 3. Is the facility contact still COREY MEYERS? If no, who is?:			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			

## **Emissions Unit Section** <u>1 –concrete batch plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I:       FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1.       Date of last inspection:       1/19/10	(check 🗹 box for each d	only one question)
<ul> <li>2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:</li> <li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li> <li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li> <li>c. If fort even of event in the second within 20 days of event second secon</li></ul>	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
<ul> <li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?</li> <li>d. Date of last VE test: 1/19/10</li> </ul>	Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?</li> <li>f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? <u>34.02</u> tons/hour</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? X/A</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check $\blacksquare$ box for each of	only one question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
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
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opticity of <u>o</u> /o for the ingress six initiate divertige.</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 con-		
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
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>37.12</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g.1) - g.3$ <i>) below. If answer NO, then skip</i> $g.1) - g.3$ <i>) and go to a</i>	☐ Yes h.	🗌 No
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat</li> </ol>	Yes	🗌 No
duration?	Yes 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 colle		
<ul> <li>conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?</li> <li>2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute</li> </ul>	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?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	Yes	🗌 No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	- 🛛 Yes - 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
<ol> <li>Does this facility include:         <ul> <li>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.)?</li> <li>If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🛛 No
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consur for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 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
<ul> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li></ul>		
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access</li> </ul>	Yes	D 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:		(check 🗹	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both s concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>I</i> )		box for each <i>g question 2.</i> )	-
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 or I		<b>—</b>	
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific			L No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica			🗌 No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a		mit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur		e)? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it			
co-located at the permitted facility?		🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t			
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admin			🖂 No
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?		TYes	🛛 No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?		🗌 Yes	🛛 No
<ul><li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?</li><li>d. A change in ownership?</li></ul>		Yes	No No
d. A change in ownership?		- 🗌 Yes	🛛 No
4. If the answer to any question $3a - d$ is YES, was a new registration		_	
30 days prior to the change?		- 🗌 Yes	No
Norma Ali	2/2/11		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	2/2/12		
Inspector's Signature			
inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection	
COMMENTS: Inspector, Norma Ali met with Corey Myers, Operation	ons Manager and Kevett Mickle, C	•	ı Grove
<b>COMMENTS:</b> Inspector, Norma Ali met with Corey Myers, Operation Scientific & Engineering Co. to audit the annual visual emissions compared to the annual visual emiss	ons Manager and Kevett Mickle, C	•	1 Grove
COMMENTS: Inspector, Norma Ali met with Corey Myers, Operation	ons Manager and Kevett Mickle, C	•	ı Grove

Plant was not operating, except for the annual compliance test. Roads were wet. No PM was observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors.