CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)
AIRS ID#: 7775275 DA		ARRIVE: <u>12:43 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>3:10 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: AT			
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email:	ORLANDO 32806-391' D REPRESENTATIVE: SIGU		(407)841-8409 (407)312-7119
CONTACT NAME: S Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIO	IGURD BO DD: 6/1/2009 / 6/1/2014 (effective date) (end date)	PHONE: Mobile:	
Facility Section			

PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u> <u>STATUS</u> (check *I* only one box)

IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s): Robert Carbery/Plant Manager	(check 🗹 box for each	2
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD BO?	🛛 Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

<u>1-CCB Plant-silo (cement)w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>		
	1-CCB Plant-silo (cement)w/siloto	p baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
 Date of last inspection: <u>2/19/09</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? 		Question)
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 2/19/09 	🗌 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>35.8</u> tons/hour 		□ 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 N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	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	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	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?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 c. Did the visible emission test restated in an opacity of <u>u</u> /s for the ingless sin limited average. f. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo of that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A - silo not lo		
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>36</u> tons/hour 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 a		🛛 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 duration?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi	ch is separate	
 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? 5 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?		□ 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? <u>36.47</u> tons/hour.		□ No

2-CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop ba	ghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 1/16/09	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one 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 	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 1/16/09 N/A 	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>35.6</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	D 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 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		1
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check \blacksquare box for each of	only one question)
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?	Xes 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?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo contract ∇A		
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?		No
 f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>36</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?		□ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	e and	
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu	tes	
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? 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>5</u> minutes. 		No 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?	\boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes	□ No □ 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	🗌 No

6 -CCB Plant-cement weigh hopper w/individual baghouse su	bject to 5% Opacity Limit
---	---------------------------

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>		only one
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/19/10}{2}$	box for each	question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	X Yes	No No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	\square Yes	$\boxed{\times}$ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
operation? X/N/A	Yes	No No
d. Date of last VE test: 2/19/10		
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	Xes Yes	No No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?	Yes	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	🗌 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 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART 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 amissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	V vas	
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 $\underline{0}$ % 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)?		
	1 . 1 .	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo collector exhaust points was the		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \boxtimes N/A – silo not load		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	L Yes	∐ No
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 $a_1 = a_2$ below. If anywer NO, then skin $a_1 = a_2$ and so to	L Yes	
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 No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat duration?	\square Ves	🗌 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 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>5</u> minutes.		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	Xes Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		D No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underbrace{0}_{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.		

7 – CCB Plant-truck loadout w/shroud & central dust collector subject to	o 5% O	pacity Limit
--	--------	--------------

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 2/19/10	(check 🗹 box for each	only one 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 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 2/19/10 N/A 	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 		☐ 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 N/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: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		1
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?	Xes 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	🗌 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? \bigotimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loade. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		Dection.
 f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? 	T 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	h	_
 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 ites	🗌 No
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 collected and the silo 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>5</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?		□ No □ 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	🗌 No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
	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? 	- 🛛 Yes - 🖾 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
 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 general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 		🛛 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	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal prop275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propa		0?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consume for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	•
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?		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?3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🛛 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both st concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If</i>		g question 2.)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		—	—
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (<i>If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.</i>)		- 🗌 Yes	∐ No
a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or L	ocal Air Program by telephone,		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p			🗌 No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine			□ No
c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat	ion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	5)]	
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	ousiness days prior to relocation?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate at	r construction or air operation per	mit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit i			
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose?	ose (1.e, there is no repeated usage	e)? [] Yes	L No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it	vas	—	—
co-located at the permitted facility?		🗌 Yes	∐ No ∏ No
in TES, were any periods more than o months in duration.			
CHANGES		(check 🗹	•
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the			
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation			
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of	ismanive change at the facture $/$	V.	\square N ₂
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:			⊠ No □ No
			⊠ No □ No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	f the change?	🗌 Yes	D No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	f the change?	🗌 Yes	☐ No ⊠ No
 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 substa 	f the change?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there beena. Installation of any new process equipment?b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	f the change?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ⊠ 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 substation. d. A change in ownership?	f the change?		☐ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ 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 substad. A change in ownership?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No 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 substad. A change in ownership?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No No
 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 substad. A change in ownership?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No 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 substad. A change in ownership?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub 9/8/2011 9/8/2011 Date of Inspection	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No No
 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 substad. A change in ownership?	f the change? ntially different? n form and the appropriate fee sub	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No No

COMMENTS: The inspector Norma Ali, met with Rob Carbery, Plant Manager and Matt Welborn, consultant from Arlington Environmental Services, Inc. to audit the compliance test for this facility. Emission units tested are as follows: EU002 Middle Silo - loading rate = 36.47 tph

EU003 North Silo - loading rate = 36.35 tph

EU006 DC above weigh scale tested for 5 minutes

EU007 CDC truck load out tested for 5 minutes. Only one truck load out, due to slow business and it was late during the day.Opacity obseved on all emission points was Zero percent. Yards are paved, no PM leaving the property was observed. No objectionable odors noticed.