

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN		ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [ RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [	_	AINT/DISCOVE	· · · —	
ΑI	RS ID#: 0951283 DAT	TE: <u>10/16/12</u>	ARRIVE:	<u>11:55 AM</u>	DEPART: 14:10 P	<u>M</u>
FA	CILITY NAME: REG	SENCY PARK READY-MI	X PLANT			
FA	CILITY LOCATION:	11525 United Way				
		ORLANDO 32824	-7609			
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZED Email: DNTACT NAME: SIG Email: WIITLEMENT PERIO		2/2013	Mobile	E: (407)841-8409	
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
		ODUCTORY MEETING esentative(s): Jose Medina,			(check box for	only one each question)
	Brief Notes:					
	Is the Authorized Repre If no, who is?:	esentative still SIGURD BO	*?		🛚 Ye	es 🗀No
3.		lity provide an administrativill SIGURD BO*?				=
4.	Will facility be conduct If yes, was the complian	ing VE test(s) during today nce authority notified at least	st 15 days in advan	nce?		= 1

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/11 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<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 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	
	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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	Yes	☐ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate?tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</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? 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
	<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? ~35 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No

# Emissions Unit Section 2 – CCB Plant-split silo #1, comp #2 (cement) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1. Date of last inspection: 10/14/11 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?	(check ☑ box for each  ☐ Yes	only one question)  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
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?	⊠ 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 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?f. What was the silo loading rate? ~37 tons/hour		□ No
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 Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	Yes	□ 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	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? minute.	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?		☐ No ☐ 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> <li>d. What was the process rate? <u>~38</u> tons/hour.</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-split silo#2,comp#1(flyash/slag)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/11 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
	<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 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	
	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 rate duration?		☐ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</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 ector	_
	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? ~ 3 to 6 min		☐ 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? ~35 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

# Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-split silo#2,comp#2(flyash/slag)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/11 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?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		□ 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
	<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
	<ul> <li>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 loade.</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	ded during insp	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? $\sim 33$ 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?	te and	□ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</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 collection.</li> </ul>	ites 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? ~3- 6 minute	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	☐ No ☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?d. What was the process rate? ~34 tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	□ No

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> only one
	`
1. Date of last inspection: 10/14/11	box for each question)
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	N/A Yes No
d. Date of last VE test: 9/7/11	,,,,,
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the	test? X Yes No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	
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 st	ata
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?	
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	(check <b>☑</b> only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)
	con for the question,
	<u>_</u>
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit	?
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test conducted according to Er A Method 9: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
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
1 D. Carlo Calla and a Company of the all and a floor of the second at the floor of	24
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No $\boxtimes$ 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 coll	
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$	
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	
duration?	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? _	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust coll-	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batche	<u> </u>
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate an	d duration? X Yes No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? ~3	<u> </u>
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site vis	<u>3 - 6</u> minutes. it?
	<u>3 - 6</u> minutes. it?
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site vis	<u>3 - 6</u> minutes. it?
<ul> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site vis <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> </li> </ul>	<u>8 - 6</u> minutes. it?
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?	<u>8 - 6</u> minutes. it?

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

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/11 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li></ul>		□ 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
	<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
	<ul> <li>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 loade.</li> <li>e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	ded during ins	
	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 raduration?	te and	□ No
	<ul> <li>3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth.</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>	ites 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? ~3-6 minute	? 🛛 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	☐ 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)**

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 box for each	
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?		<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
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 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? 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	<ul><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li><li> No</li></ul>
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal prop 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propar	$\frac{\text{ane/yr}}{\text{ne/yr}} \le 1.00$	?
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?	nption - 🛭 Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS	/ 1 ale 📝	1
GENERAL COMPANIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	-
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
Does the owner or operator:     a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- X 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, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general	S	
permit and Department rules?	X Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(che	ck 🗹 only one		
1. Is the facility: stationary \(\nabla\): relocatable \(\pa\): or consisting of both	hov fo	r each question)		
1. Is the facility: stationary \( \subseteq \); relocatable \( \subseteq \); or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \( \subseteq \) 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?	_	∕es □ 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 Notific</li> </ul>	prior to changing location? \(\sigma\) Yeation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]			
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	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	es ∐ No Yes ∏ No		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a 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?  b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it	in that separate permit: pose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)?	∕es □ No		
co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes No		
<u> </u>				
<u>CHANGES</u>		ck 🗹 only one r each question)		
<ol> <li>Administrative Changes:         <ol> <li>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 admi</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ol> </li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been         <ol> <li>Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol></li></ol>	the facility or authorized representative not not the facility or any emissions units or nistrative change at the facility? You the change? You tantially different?	•		
Norma Ali	10/16/12			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	12/31/2013			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
COMMENTS: Inspector audited 6 VEs on this date. The loading rate EU001 ~35tph, opacity observed = 0% EU002 ~38 tph, opacity of EU003 ~35 tph, opacity observed = 0% EU004 ~34 tph, opacity of EU005 Truck load out, 4 trucks observed, opacity = 0% EU006 4 Trustransing on the raw materials piles. No objectionable odors The facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.	bserved = $0\%$ bserved = $0\%$ ucks observed, opacity = $0\%$			