

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		· / —			
AIRS ID#: 7775275 DATE: <u>3/22/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>8:26</u>	DEPART: <u>11:30</u>			
FACILITY NAME: ATLANTA AVENUE READ	OY-MIX PLANT				
FACILITY LOCATION: 1406 ATLANTA	AVE				
ORLANDO 328	306-3917				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Email: CONTACT NAME: SIGURD BO Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/1/2009 / 6/1/2 (effective date) (end	Мо РН Мо 2014	ONE: (407)841-8409 bile: (407)312-7119 ONE: (407)841-8409 bile: (407)312-7119			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETIN 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Jeff Wood Brief Notes:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)			
Is the Authorized Representative still SIGURD If no, who is?:	BO?				
If different, did the facility provide an administra 3. Is the facility contact still SIGURD BO? If no, who is?:					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during tod If yes, was the compliance authority notified at I					

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

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		nly one
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{2/19/2009}{2}$	box for each qu	iestion)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	<u>_</u>	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		⊠ No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?		⊠ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of comment operation?d. Date of last VE test: 2/19/2009	·	☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 da f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 35.8 tons/hour		No No
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did to whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	N/A Yes [□ No ⊠ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit dur If not, what was the problem (if known)?	ring the last VE test? Yes [☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		_
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	· ·	nly one
encrosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each qu	iestion)
	_	_
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during the	this site visit? 🗵 Yes	No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?] No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-r c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity li If not, what was the problem (if known)? 		☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\sum \) Yes \(\sum \) No		_
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in pr f. What was the silo loading rate? 35.45 tons/hour	oractice?	No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the si		⊠ No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skill 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching		
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by	by a dust collector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hop	<u> </u>	_
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batc 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching d		No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during	g this site visit? 🗵 Yes [☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-r c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity li 		☐ No
d. What was the process rate? <u>35.45</u> tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-silo (flyash) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1. Date of last inspection: 9/8/2011 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/A d. Date of last VE test: 9/8/2011 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? 36.47 tons/hour h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	- ☐ Yes ☐ Yes - ☑ Yes	only one question) No No No No No
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)?		☐ No ☑ No ☐ No
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> 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?	- X Yes	☐ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	- X Yes	☐ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	- X Yes	☐ No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo c		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\bigvee \) Yes \(\bigvee \) No \(\bigvee \) N/A - silo not loate. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>36.25</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 r	ate and	
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min		☐ 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 co		
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? 10 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 conducted according to 217 Method 9. b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % 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? 36.25 tons/hour.		□ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-silo (slag) w/silotop baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 9/8/2011 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	only one question) No No No No No No No No 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	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>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute average. 	Yes	☐ No
	c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	⊠ 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 loading the silo contact that is representative of the normal silo loading rate?		
	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>35.23</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 Yes	☐ No
	2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?		☐ 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 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration	ector	□ No
2	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>10</u> minutes.		_
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 <u>0.0</u> % 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? 35.23 tons/hour.		

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-split bin (cement) compartment #1 w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1. Date of last inspection: 1-16-2009 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes No N/A Yes No the test? Yes No Yes No rt state N/A Yes No Yes No Yes No No 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	(check d only one box for each question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site v	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>0.0</u> % for the highest six-minute av c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \(\subseteq \text{ Yes} \) \(\subseteq \text{ No} \) \(\subseteq \text{ N/A} \) 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 of	collector? Yes No
If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	g.3) and go to h.
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the norm	nal batching rate and
duration? 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration	n? minutes
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust of from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (bat	
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	e and duration? X Yes No
 Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute and the six of the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the six of the highest six-minute and the six of the six of	e visit?
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-split bin (cement) compartment #2 w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 10/14/2011 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	 i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		□ 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>0.0</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 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?	Yes	☐ No
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	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? 10 minutes.	? 🛚 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 0.0 % 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

Emissions Unit Section 6 –CCB Plant-cement weigh hopper w/individual baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 9/8/2011 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
	whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? 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? If not, what was the problem (if known)?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	☐ No ☑ No ☐ 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>0.0</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 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 ins	
	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
	 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minuth. 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. 	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? 10 minutes.	? Xes	☐ 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 10 % 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

Emissions Unit Section 7 – CCB Plant-truck loadout w/shroud & central dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check \square only one box for each question)
Date of last inspection: 9/8/2011 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? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control une emissions by:	confined
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	y to
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?	⊠ Yes □ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck	_
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: 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)?	

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check very box for each	only one h question)	
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?	Yes	☐ 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 general 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	 No No No No No No	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared		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?		⊠ No	
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ☑ only one box for each 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 devices?		⊠ No	
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	_	□ No	
3.	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	
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general		□ No	

RI	LOCATABLE PLANT:		eck 🗹 o	
1.	Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plant.	of both stationary and relocatable	-	uestion)
	Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cemer soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	elow.)	Yes	□ No
	e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one busine b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation	ess day prior to changing location? Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes	□ No
	to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation I to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at le	Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes Yes	□ No
3.	If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a se and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emission a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-rout If YES, what was the purpose?	ons unit in that separate permit:	Yes	□ No
	b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how co-located at the permitted facility?	·	Yes Yes	□ No
	MANGES ministrative Changes:		eck 🗹 o or each q	only one uestion)
1. 2. <u>Ne</u>	ministrative Changes: Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone num associated with a change in ownership or with a physical re operations comprising the facility; or any other similar mine If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 3 w or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	elocation of the facility or any emissions units or or administrative change at the facility?	t Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No
3.	Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	is substantially different?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new re 30 days prior to the change?		Yes	☐ No
	Assefa Hailemariam	3/22/2012		
_	Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
		~12/31/2013		
_	Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	 I	

COMMENTS: Assefa Hailemariam from EPD Orange County met Jeff Woody, plant operator and Sig Bo, Environmental Manager, representing Cemex at 1406 Atlanta Ave, Orlando Florida. Seven VES were audited on this date which are on cement silos(EU001,EU002,EU004 and EU005), fly ash silo(EU003), Weigh hopper/ Mixer(EU006) and truck loadout(EU007). All the loading rates were with acceptableor above the minimum loading rate of 25 TPH and observed opacity was zero percent for all emission units, Fuel is not stored on this facility. All the main roads inside the facility were dry, no dust or PM was leaving the property. No water truck was observed operating during the inspection. Inspector advised to the facility plant operator Mr. Woody and Environmental Manager, Mr. Bo, of these observations.