

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 0951267 DATE: <u>1/13/12</u> ARRIVE: <u>9:54 AM</u> DEPART:	10:30 AM					
FACILITY NAME: S&L MATERIALS						
FACILITY LOCATION: 28001 SR 520						
CHRISTMAS 32709-8681						
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: TAMA DAVIS Email: CONTACT NAME: COREY MEYERS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/3/2007 / 3/3/2012 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (407)870-006 Mobile: PHONE: (407)568-768 Mobile:						
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
DADE H. ONGVER INVENODUCEODY MEDITING						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): TAMA DAVIS Brief Notes:	(check ✓ only one box for each question)					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still TAMA DAVIS?	⊠ Yes □No					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still COREY MEYERS? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐No					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	YesNo YesNo					

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 2/2/11 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 loade. 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? <u>31</u> 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?		☐ 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? minute. 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. 	n 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		⊠ 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? 31 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

Facility Section (continued)

_					
<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v box for each	only one 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 ☐ 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 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		
4.	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared that the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	ne/yr	☐ No		
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ✓ only one					
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?	box for eacl	n question)		
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		□ 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?	- X Yes	☐ No		
٥.	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 🗹	only one		
1. Is the facility stationary N. relegatable D. or consisting of both	stationery and relegatable	box for each			
1. Is the facility: stationary \(\subseteq \); relocatable \(\subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \(\subseteq \) 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?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		- L 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			∐ No		
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? Ye					
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least fiv	- ,		☐ No		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate		nit,			
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions uni		\2 \ V	□ Na		
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Tes	☐ No		
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long i					
co-located at the permitted facility?		U Yes	∐ No □ No		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
CHANGES		(check			
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)		
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of					
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation			⊠ No		
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?			⊠ No □ No		
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	<i>g</i>				
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		Yes			
a. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?			⊠ No ⊠ No		
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?			⊠ No		
d. A change in ownership?		-	⊠ No		
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrat.	ion form and the appropriate fee sub	mitted			
30 days prior to the change?		- Yes	☐ No		
Norma Ali	1/13/12				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	·····			
	12/31/2013				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection			
COMMENTS: OCEPD's inspector, Norma Ali, met with Corey Meyers, Plant Manager and Bruno Ferraro, consultant from Grove Scientific & Engineering to audit the annual visual emission test for this facility. EU001 Opacity Observed = 0% Loading rate of 31 tph.					
No objectionable odors or PM was observed leaving the property. The inspection.					
The inspector had problems finding the facility address and was only	able to audit the last 24 minutes of t	he cement sile	o loading.		