

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>2/7/2014</u>	ARRIVE: 8:26	DEPART:	9:29					
FACILITY NAME: S&L MATERIALS								
FACILITY LOCATION: 28001 SR 520								
CHRISTMAS 32709)							
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: CO Email: coreym@jr-davis.com CONTACT NAME: COREY MYERS Email: coreym@jr-davis.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/9/2012 / 3/9/2017 (effective date) (end date)	OREY MYERS	PHONE: (407)568-370 Mobile: PHONE: (407)568-370 Mobile:						
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE								
DADT H. ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING								
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Corey Myers Brief Notes:			(check ✓ only one box for each question)					
2. Is the Authorized Representative still COREY MYEI If no, who is?:	RS?		⊠ Yes □No					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative 3. Is the facility contact still COREY MYERS? If no, who is?:			☐ Yes ☐No ☑ Yes ☐No					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			∑ Yes					

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) & pugmill w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one	
1. 7	box for each		
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/8/2013}{2}$		1	
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	⊠ w	□ N.	
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?	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: 2/8/2013	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	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 38.1 tons/hour h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No	
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)?	? X 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	•	
	box for each	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?	X Yes	☐ No	
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X 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? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		☐ No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? $\underline{34.83}$ 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</i>		⊠ No	
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	☐ No	
duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? m	Yes	☐ No	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector when the second of			
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 durati 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? mi		⊠ No	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ 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 average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>34.83</u> tons/hour. 		☐ No	
d. What was the process rate: 34.03 tons/hour.			

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			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?			 No 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.)?		Yes	⊠ 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?		Yes	⊠ 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the past 5 years?	ne/yr		? ⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one 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: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	_ - M '	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?	- 🛛 Y		□ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		Yes	☐ No

(check ☑ only one box for each question) 1. Is the facility: stationary ☑; relocatable ☐; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable ☐					
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and	If only stationary, skip the following question	n 2.)			
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)		es 🗌 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 Notifi 	prior to changing location? Ye cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	es 🗌 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	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]				
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 uni 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)? Ye	es 🗌 No			
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long i co-located at the permitted facility?	Ye				
Tribb, were any periode more than a monais 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 associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation.	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? Yes No 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?					
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		s 🗌 No			
A coefe IVellousesians	2/7/2014				
Assefa Hailemariam	2/7/2014	_			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
Turn actor's Circust	Before 12/31/2015	_			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection				

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Kevett Mickle, of Grove Scientific and Engineering Services, on February 7, 2014, at 28001 SR 520 Christmas, Florida 32709 to audit the visible emission test on one emission unit. The emission unit tested had an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates was 34.83 TPH. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM was observed leaving the property during the compliance test. The facility Plant Operator, Mike Michi and Plant Operation Manager Corey Myers were present during the VE test. The facility appears to be in compliance during inspection performed on this date with the air permit.