

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>9/26/2012</u> ARRIVE: <u>9:40 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: KEVIN DOAN PHONE: 3522235340 Mobile: PHONE: 3525522332				
Email: Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 7/14/2011 / 7/14/2016 (effective date) (end date)				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box)				
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	LIANCE			
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Kevin Doan	(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
Brief Notes: Plant Manager				
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?: Kevin Doan/Plant Manager	Yes □No □ Yes □No			
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: 8/23/2011 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 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?	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 Yes	□ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
	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?		pection. No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 29.7 tons/hour		— N-
	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	 Yesh.	⊠ No
	 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 batching rate 		☐ No
	duration?	- Yes	☐ No
	3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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 coll	lector	_
	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? 29.7 tons/hour. 	∑ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-mixer/weigh hopper in controlled bldg enclosure subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 8/23/2011 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? \[\] N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? VE NOT REQUIRED, AS PER THE PERMIT	Tyes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
	RT II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
	confined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and nveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards		1
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:	ned	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?	- X Yes	□ No
	3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	_	□ No
			□ No
2	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:	🗵 Yes	∐ No
	a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(.11		1
				only one uestion)
1	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:	0011101	•• q	(desiron)
1.	a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?	⊠ Ye	:S	□ No
	b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?	⊠ Ye		☐ No
	c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	⊠ Ye	s	☐ No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception with and activities that are required to a require the standard of the control of	of		
	units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	- □ Ye	·S	⊠ No
	If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		.5	
	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?	Ye	es es es	No No 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?	iption - 🛭 Ye	s	☐ No
C.	ENIED A L. CONDUCTIONIC			1
Gi	ENERAL CONDITIONS			only one uestion)
1		JUA IUI	cacii q	ucstion)
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?		es	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator:	_		
	a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- ⊠ Ye	S	∐ 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?	- 🛛 Ye	s	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access	s S	-	
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	🛛 Ye	es	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both	boy fo	ock ☑ only one or each question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (ion 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.		Yes 🗌 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 Notificents. 	y prior to changing location?	Yes No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificato the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes No
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 pu If YES, what was the purpose?		Yes No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes No
CHANGES Administrative Changes		eck ☑ only one or 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 operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions units or inistrative change at the facility?	Yes ⊠ No Yes □ No
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 sub d. A change in ownership?	?stantially different?	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrat 30 days prior to the change?		Yes No
D'II Di., J	0/26/2012	
Bill Rhodes	9/26/2012	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	12/31/2013	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: Bill Rhodes with OCEPD, arrived at the facility at approximately 9:45 AM, 9/26/2012, to audit a VE, as per permit conditions, on one emission unit (EU-001). It should be noted that EU-002, an active emission unit, was not VE tested, as per the permit, since it is located inside of a building, and therefore, not required. The emission unit tested was EU-001. Personnel present were Kevin Doan, Plant Manager, representing Raney Building Materials, Inc., as well as Kent Bottorf, the environmental consultant, representing Bottorf Associates, Inc. The observed opacity was 0%, and the silo loading rate was 29.7 tons/hour, which is acceptable. EU-002 did not have any fugitive emissions coming out of building. 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.