

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 1050371 DATE: 10/15/2010 ARRIVE: 1:00 p.m. DE	PART: <u>1:30 p.m.</u>		
FACILITY NAME: MASCHMEYER-DAVENPORT FACILITY			
FACILITY LOCATION: 4949 SAND MINE RD			
DAVENPORT 33897-3414			
Email: Mobile: (561) CONTACT NAME: DAX DAWSON PHONE: (561)	848-9112 718-0551 718-2696 718-2696		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Matt Dillard Brief Notes: Matt was only operator on site at time of inspection	(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT TUCKER?			
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still DAX DAWSON? If no, who is?:			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?			

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-silo (cement) w/silotop baghouse, 600 Bbl (95.8T) subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 3/31/2008 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	No No No No No No 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
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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		□ No
	 d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo control that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during insp - Yes Yes	
	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? 2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	Yes te and 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 collected 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	n is separate lector ?	□ 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 % 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.	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop baghouse, 400 Bbl (58.0T) subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Data of last inspection: 3/21/2008	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: 3/21/2008 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 	∑ Yes∑ Yes	□ 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? 30 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. 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		□ No □ 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 load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	ded during ins Yes Yes Yes h. Yes ate and	pection. No No No
duration? 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.	ates h is separate	□ No
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	? 🗌 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? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % 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? tons/hour.	- Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-weigh hopper/scale w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one
	box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{3/21/2008}{2}$	4
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 operation? ————————————————————————————————————	N/A Yes No
d. Date of last VE test: $\underline{2/2/2010}$ 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	Yes No
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report sta	ate
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	VE tost? Ves No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last If not, what was the problem (if known)?	VE test? ⊠ Yes ☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(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 visit	? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute av	
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 sile conducted at a rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \square Yes \square No \square N/A - s	
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	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust colle	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$,	
 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 leading to the companion of the properties. 	
duration?	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? _	minutes
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust colle	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batche	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate an	
 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site vis 	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute av	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-truck loadout w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: 3/21/2008		4
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	⊠ v	□ Na
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?	- Miles	∐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: 2/2/2010		□ N.
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? tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	N	
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	X Yes	∐ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hourk. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- X Yes	□ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	- M les	□ No
If not, what was the problem (if known):		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	
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 % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	TYes	☐ No
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 d		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	L Yes	∐ No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	□ Vas	□ 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 go to	∐ Yes	∐ No
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		
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	nutes	_
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes and the state of		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		No 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 % for the highest six-minute average.c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	\ \ Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	1 Cs	
tomation process rate: tomation		

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ 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 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? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the prop	-	No No No No No
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?		☐ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑	only one
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed	box for each	
2.	the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control devices? Does the owner or operator:	Yes	⊠ No
	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	- X Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No
	permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		• ,
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes) r Local Air Program by telephone, y prior to changing location? [Continuous days following a relocation? [Continuous days following days following a relocation? [Continuous days following days followed days follo	NoNoNoNoNo
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 un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?	it in that separate permit: surpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>		only one
Administrative Changes	box for each	i question)
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes	No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes sof the change? Yes Yes t?	∑ No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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?	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes s of the change? Yes Yes extantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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?	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes s of the change? Yes Yes extantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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?	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes s of the change? Yes Yes extantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted	No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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?	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes s of the change? Yes Yes translated Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes	No No No No No No
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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?	f the facility or authorized representative not on of the facility or any emissions units or ministrative change at the facility? Yes softhe change? Yes Yes estantially different? Yes Yes tion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes 10/15/2010	No No No No No No

COMMENTS: The facility tracks all shipments and had recent records on the computer and copies of bills of lading for cement tankers. The official records are kept at the main office in Castleberry. A crusher is not brough on site. All left over concrete, or bad concrete, is hauled off to the dump. The facility does quarterly inspections and maintenance on their baghouses. A street sweeper and watering truck are used on the grounds as needed. The storage piles are continuously watered by sprinklers. The facility appeared to be in compliance with all permit and state regulations.