

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
AIRS ID#: 0951271 DATE: <u>8/23/2011</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:45 AM</u> DEPART:	11:00 AM			
FACILITY NAME: RANEY BUILDING MATERIALS-BLOCK PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION: 2983 ORANGE AVE				
APOPKA 32703-3346				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ARTHUR RANEY Email: CONTACT NAME: MIKE LANE Email: mike@raneybuildingmaterials.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/14/2011 / 7/14/2016  PHONE: (352)429-03 Mobile: PHONE: (352)223-53 Mobile:				
(effective date) (end date)				
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 <del>[</del> ]			
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Mike Lane</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
Brief Notes: Change of ownership on 6/13/2011				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ARTHUR RANEY?	⊠ Yes □No			
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still MIKE LANE?  If no, who is?:	YesNo YesNo			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?				

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

1. Date of last inspection: 3/26/2010 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		only one question)  No No No No No No
<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		⊠ No □ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check <b>v</b> 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?	X Yes	☐ 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>	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? \( \subseteq \text{Yes} \) \( \subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not lo} \) e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.  No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>40.26</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 $g(3)$	to h.	_
<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</li> </ol>		☐ No
duration?	Yes	☐ No
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 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duratio  2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	n? Yes	⊠ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	🛛 Yes	□ No
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	🛚 Yes	∐ No
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 41.84 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	X Yes	☐ No

## **Facility Section (continued)**

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
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?				
2. Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (wit units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210 Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	0.300(3) or			
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same faci If YES, what other general permit units or activities?				
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 belo				
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propane/yr < 1.00?  275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane/yr				
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of month for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	hly fuel consumption   Yes   No			
CENTER VI CONDITIONS				
GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>✓</b> only one box for each question)			
Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution devices?	n control			
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 compared terms and conditions of the air general permit?				
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Dep to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with a permit and Department rules?	the air general			

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	stationary and relocatable box for e	only one ach question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (A		2.)
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.)		No No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or         e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification</li> </ul>	prior to changing location? Yes	No 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	ration Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	
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	air construction or air operation permit,	_
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose?	rpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)?  Yes	No No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes	
CHANGES		only one ach question)
<ul> <li>Administrative Changes:</li> <li>1. 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</li> <li>2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ul>	n of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility? X Yes	
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?	? Yes tantially different? Yes	No No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrati 30 days prior to the change?	on form and the appropriate fee submitted	No 🗌 No
Bill Rhodes	8/23/2011	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	8/23/2012	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

**COMMENTS:** OCEPD personnel arrived at the facility at approximately 8:45 AM, 8/23/2011, to audit a VE, as per permit conditions. Personnel present were Mike Lane, facility contact, as well as Kent Bottorf, the environmental consultant, representing Bottorf Associates, Inc. The observed opacity was 0%, and the silo loading rate was 41.84 tons/hour, which is acceptable. At the time of the site inspection, the yard was dry, however the winds were minimal and no dust or odors were observed leaving the property. It should be noted that on 6/13/2011, ownership of the facility was changed from Florida Building Materials to Raney Building Materials.