NUMBROL PROTECTION
Same Care
FLORIDA

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)			
AIRS ID#: 0710229 DATE: <u>7/8/2014</u>	ARRIVE: <u>7:15 am</u>	DEPART: <u>9:55 am</u>			
FACILITY NAME: PREFERRED MATERIALS-CAN	NAL ST FACILITY				
FACILITY LOCATION: 4262 CANAL ST					
FORT MYERS 3391	16-6546				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: DA Email: Darryl.Fales@preferredmaterials.com CONTACT NAME: ADRIENNE COPPOCK Email: adrienne.coppock@oldcastlematerials.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/4/2009 / 10/4/201 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	: (239)992-1400 : (813)384-3089 (816)215-2827			
Facility Section					
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
BADT IL ONGITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Dan Dunn		(check \square only one box for each question)			
Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Representative still DARRYL FAL If no, who is?:	.ES?	XesNo			
If different, did the facility provide an administrative 3. Is the facility contact still ADRIENNE COPPOCK? - If no, who is?:					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least					

Emissions Unit Section

1 – CCB Plant-Two Compartment Cement Silo-compartment no. 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit

Emissions Unit Section

D A DEL EN EL DEVIENU ADIAD ELA INGREGERIAN			
PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>			
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{4/20}{2010}$			
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:			
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Xes Yes	□ No	
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes	\bowtie 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: $5/2/2013$			
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No	
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	🛛 Yes	No No	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 28.2 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? 🖾 N/A	Yes	∐ No	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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?	🛛 Yes	∐ No	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?			
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
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?	Xes	🗌 No	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.			
c. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes Yes	□ 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 conducted at a rate			
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \bigotimes Yes \Box No \Box N/A – silo not load			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	Yes	No No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>33.4</u> tons/hour	_	<u></u>	
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 $g(1) - g(3)$ and $g(2) - g(3)$ and $g(3) - g(3)$			
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 rat duration?		🗌 No	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut			
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 colle			
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? <u>6</u> minutes.			
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Yes 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	5		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	No No	
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.			
		l.	

na Unit Coati iaai

Emissions Unit Section <u>3 – CCB Plant-Two Compartment Flyash/Slag Silo-compartment no. 1 subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>			
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{4/20}{2010}$			
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	V.		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes Yes	∐ No ⊠ 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: 5/2/2013			
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	🖂 Yes	□ No	
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	🛛 Yes	D No	
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 24.97 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? 🛛 N/A	Yes	No No	
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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?	🛛 Yes	∐ No	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?			
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			
enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	🛛 Yes	L 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.			
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 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 conducted at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No	
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>24.7</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?	Yes	🗌 No	
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat			
duration?		🗌 No	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu			
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 coll			
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? <u>6</u> minutes.	i res	∐ No	
 What was the batching fate? tonshour. What was the batching duration? <u>6</u> minutes. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 	Xes	No No	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	\boxtimes Yes		
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	<u></u>		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes	No No	

d. What was the process rate? _____ tons/hour.

Emissions Unit Section

4 – CCB Plant-Two Compartment Flyash/Slag Silo-compartment no. 2 subject to 5% Opacity Limit			
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION			
 Date of last inspection: <u>4/20/2010</u> 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?	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ 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: <u>5/2/2013</u> 	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? <u>27.1</u> tons/hour	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	☐ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No	
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.		🗌 No	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes 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 loaded during inspection.			
 e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>25.6</u> tons/hour 	_	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		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 	te and	No	
 duration?	ites	🗌 No	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? <u>6</u> minutes.		🗌 No	
 Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % 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. 			

Emissions Unit Section 5 – CCB Plant-Cement Weigh Hopper subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>			
 Date of last inspection: <u>4/20/2010</u> Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 			
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes □ Yes	☐ No ⊠ No	
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 5/2/2013 	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?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour	Yes Yes	☐ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment			
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No	
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	
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>o</u> % for the ingless six-initial average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Xes 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 loaded during inspection.			
 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 		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 f	☐ Yes h.	🛛 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 rat 	Yes	🗌 No	
duration?	Yes Yes	🗌 No	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is separate			
 from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector 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? <u>6</u> minutes. 		🗌 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?	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ 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? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 No	

Facility Section (continued)

C	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		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?	Yes ⊠Yes	☐ 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.)?		🔀 No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene 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	No No No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr +gal gasoline/yr +MM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propar		?
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

<u>G</u>	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		7	N-
2.	devices? Does the owner or operator:	- 🗀 Y	es	🛛 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 Y	ſes	🗌 No
3	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		ſes	🗌 No
5.	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		es	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following stationary)	(check 🗹 box for each <i>ng question 2.</i>)	question)	
 Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 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 prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900] 	(6)]	□ No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?	5)]	🗌 No	
 If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage If YES, what was the purpose? 		🗌 No	
 b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? 	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	D No No	
CHANGES	(check 🗹 box for each	•	
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of 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

a. Installation of any new process equipment? ----- Yes

d. A change in ownership? ----- Yes

4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? — Yes

2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? ------ Yes

Diane Loughlin

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

<u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been

Duare Loughei

Inspector's Signature

7/8/2014

Date of Inspection

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS:

No No

No No

No No

No No

No No

No No