

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER  ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 0951283 DATE: <u>11/3/2010</u>	ARRIVE: 8:55 AM	DEPART: <u>10:00 AM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: CEMEX CONSTRUCTION N	FACILITY NAME: CEMEX CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS REGENCY PARK READY-MIX PLANT		
FACILITY LOCATION: 11525 UNITED W.	AY		
ORLANDO 3282	24-7609		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:         SIGURD BO         PHONE:         (407)841-8409           Email:         Mobile:         (407)312-7119           CONTACT NAME:         SIGURD BO         PHONE:         (407)841-8409           Email:         Mobile:         (407)312-7119           ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:         10/12/2008 / 10/12/2013         (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. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Sigurd Bo  Brief Notes:	<u>3</u>	(check ☑ only one box for each question)	
2. Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD Bound in the still SIGURD Bound Bound in the still SIGURD Bound B	0?		
If different, did the facility provide an administrat  3. Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO? If no, who is?:			
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least			

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

PA	RT I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1.	Date of last inspection: $8/13/2009$	box for each	question)
	Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
	a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	⊠ Yes	☐ 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? ————————————————————————————————————	Yes	☐ No
	d. Date of last VE test: 8/13/2009 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?	<ul><li>✓ Yes</li><li>✓ Yes</li></ul>	□ 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 whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☐ No
	<ul><li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li><li>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)?</li></ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
PA	ART 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
	<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>	Yes	☐ No
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co	nducted at a ra	ate
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \( \subseteq \text{Yes} \) \( \subseteq \text{N/A} - \text{silo not load} \)		pection.
	e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	· U Yes	∐ No
	f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	Yes	No 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?2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate	Yes	☐ No
	duration?		☐ No
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate	
	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? 13 minutes.		☐ No
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

# Emissions Unit Section 6 -CCB Plant-truck loadout, w/shroud & central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 8/13/2009 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No No
	<ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No
PA	RT 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
	<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>	⊠ Yes	☐ 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 insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? 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?		☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	n is separate	
	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? 6 minutes.	Yes 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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	∑ Yes □ 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

## **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each o	
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
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.)?  If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gener 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)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
	$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \text{gal gasoline/yr} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$		
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?	ption - X Yes	☐ No
	ENERAL CONDITIONS	- [7	
Gı		(check <b>☑</b> box for each of	
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?	- 🛛 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?	- 🛛 Yes	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check ☑ only one	
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ box for each question) concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary, skip the following question 2.</i> )		
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.)		
<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 Notifice</li> </ul>	prior to changing location? Yes No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification	ess days following a relocation? Yes No	
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate at a facility with a separate of the control of		
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose?	in that separate permit:	
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?		
11 125, were any periods more than 6 months in daration.		
CHANGES		
CHANGES	(check <b>☑</b> only one box for each question)	
Administrative Changes:	•	
. 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 admi		
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?	Yes No	
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?		
c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? Yes N		
d. A change in ownership?		
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrati 30 days prior to the change?		
30 days prior to the change?	Yes	
Ilka Bundy	11/3/2010	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	11/3/2011	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

**COMMENTS:** Ilka Bundy met with Kaye Arlington of Arlington Environmental Services, Inc. on November 3, 2010 to audit visible emission test on EUs 005 (weigh hopper mixing) and 006 (ready-mix load out). These units could not be tested on 8/12/10 since the facility did not have a job that required batching. Both emission units had an opacity of zero percent. The batching rate was not determined for either emission unit. The facility appears to be in compliance with their permit conditions at this time. No objectionable odors were noted. No PM was observed leaving the property.