

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

NSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLA	AINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0710235 DATE: <u>4/18/13</u>	ARRIVE: 7am	DEPART	: <u>9:30 am</u>	
FACILITY NAME: GULF COAST MTLS OF SW	FL-ALICO RD PLANT			
FACILITY LOCATION: 15470 ALICO RD				
FORT MYERS 3	33913-8263			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: ROBERT BROWN* Email: rbrown@gemcontracting.com CONTACT NAME: ROBERT BROWN* Email: rbrown@gemcontracting.com Email: rbrown@gemcontracting.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/14/2012 / 6/14/2017 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (239)334-8800 PHONE: (239)872-8800 Mobile: (239)872-8800				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	G		(check ☑	only one
Name(s) of facility representative(s): <u>Max Brown</u>		box for each	•	
Brief Notes:				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still ROBERT B If no, who is?:	BROWN*?		⊠ Yes	□No
If different, did the facility provide an administrat 3. Is the facility contact still ROBERT BROWN*? - If no, who is?:				□No □No
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during toda If yes, was the compliance authority notified at le				□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-split silo (60/40 flyash) w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 1/9/2009 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes
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 ☑ only one box for each question)
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 resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average. 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 of the that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	o not loaded during inspection. Yes No No ound go to h. Yes No atching rate and Yes No minutes out collector duration? Yes No minutes. Yes No Yes No No No No No No No No No No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-split silo (60/40 cement) w/central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1. Date of la 2. Past Visil a. Was a b. Has a v c. If first ope d. Date o e. Was th f. Did the g. What h. If wei wheth i. Did the j. What w	ast inspection: 1/5/2009 ble Emissions (VE) tests: VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	(check ☑ box for each of the box for each of	only one question) No No No No No No No No
	what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: S	TACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1. Was a v	isible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	ne visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	☐ No
c. Did th	sible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average. e visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
	g visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo con 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
g. Are er	was the silo loading rate? tons/hour nissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
1) W	hen continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$) and go to a as the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes Yes	⊠ No
	aring the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rat		⊠ No
· ·	What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute missions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which		
fror	n the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collected while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?	ector	□ No
2) W	That was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute	es.	
a. Was th	sible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? ne visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	YesYes	∐ No □ No
c. Did th	sible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average. e visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?was the process rate? $\underline{26}$ tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 – Materials Handling - Facility Wide subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check ☑ box for each o	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 1/5/2009 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)?		⊠ No ⊠ No □ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:	ned	
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 		☐ No
control emissions?	X Yes	☐ No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	X Yes	☐ No
particulate matter from stock piles?	- X Yes	☐ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	- 🛚 Yes	☐ No
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?	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check v 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? 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	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared		0?
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?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the six general parmit and complies with all	_	□ 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?		☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general		□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:	(check 🗹	•
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</i>)	box for each of question 2.)	question)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	- Yes	□ No
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	5)]	□ 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(6) to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? -)]	□ No
3. 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:	mit,	
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?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was)?	∐ No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	- Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check 🗹 o	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions unit operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	its or - 🔲 Yes	⊠ No □ No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?		⊠ No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	- 🔲 Yes	⋈ No⋈ No⋈ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee sub 30 days prior to the change?	mitted - Yes	⊠ No
Inspector's Name (Please Print) Date of Inspection		
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next Ins	pection	

COMMENTS: During loading of the fly-ash silo, I observed the connection at the load hose emitted dust at which time the driver immediately poured water on the connection preventing further emission. During loading, the connection tried out again twice and the driver poured water on it both times within a reasonable amount of time.

During the VE test, emissions was observed in the concrete exhaust pipe that leads to the baghouse emissions near the top of silo II. The inspector notified the facility representative who immediately climbed to the top of the silo for inspection, noticed 2 pinholes, returned to get tape, went back and secured the leaks. It was recommended to him to check all joints and fill-pipe connections to ensure they are properly sealed and either repair or replace.

Photos of thefacility and the cement exhuast pipe are attached to this report.