CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE		
AIRS ID#: 1150150 DA	TE: <u>11/30/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>~12:25 pm</u>	DEPART: <u>~3:40 pm</u>	
FACILITY NAME: PY	RAMID PAVERS, LLC			
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 510 Paul Morris Dr			
	ENGLEWOOD 34223	-3960		
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email:	D REPRESENTATIVE: BRA	D WALKER PHONE Mobile:	: (941)474-2323	
CONTACT NAME: B	RUCE NILES	PHONE	: (941)474-2323	
Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIO	OD: 8/3/2008 / 8/3/2013 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile:		
Facility Section				

PART I:	INSPECTION	COMPLIANCE STATUS	(check 🗹	only one box)		
---------	-------------------	-------------------	----------	---------------	--	--

	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brad Walker and Bruce Niles	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still BRAD WALKER?	🛛 Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still BRUCE NILES?	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 – cement/ flyash/ slag storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/5/2008	(check 🗹 box for each c	only one Juestion)
 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 aparticipation was a VE test performed within 20 days of commencing 	⊠ Yes □ Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	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 	⊠ 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 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 Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		1
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 box for each c	only one juestion)
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 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 cor		
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?		ection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? 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 to R	D Yes	🖾 No
 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 rat 	Yes	🗌 No
 a) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minut 	Yes	🗌 No
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 collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? 2) What was the batching rate? <u>?</u> tons/hour. What was the batching duration? <u>?</u> 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

Emissions Unit Section 2 –sand/stone storage area; vard area subject to Reasonable Precautions

<u><u><u></u></u> sumastone storuge area, yara area subject to reasonable recautions</u>		
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: <u>12/5/2008</u> 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? N/A c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? 	🗌 Yes	☐ No ⊠ No ☐ No
r		
<u>PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.</u> <u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> <u>Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions 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
 application of water of environmentary safe date suppressant encineties when necessary to control emissions? 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 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
 a) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of 	🗌 Yes	🛛 No
particulate matter from stock piles?	🛛 Yes	No No

b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? ---- 🗌 Yes

a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ------ Yes

b. If tested: (_____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- Yes

c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? Facility needs to be swept more frequently/ H2O applied; VE observed at the time

2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:

of inspection; paved surfaces had PM dust buildup.

No No

□ No

No No

Emissions Unit Section <u>3 – weigh hopper subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION		(check 🗹	only one
1. Data of last inspection: $\frac{12}{5}/2009$	b	ox for each c	•
 Date of last inspection: <u>12/5/2008</u> Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: 			
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		Xes	No 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?	N/A	Yes	🗌 No
 d. Date of last VE test: e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the second secon	or the test?	🛛 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		Yes	\bowtie No
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the re	port state		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?		Yes	No 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 second seco	a last VE tast?	Yes	🗌 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)? <u>EU has not been tested; will test by 12/3</u>			
,, ,	<u></u>		
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other			only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	b	ox for each q	uestion)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this sit	e 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% for the highest six-mir	ute average.	_	_
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		Yes	□ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)? <u>EU has not been tested; will test by 1</u>	2/31/2010.		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the load	ling of the silo cond	lucted at a rat	te
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \Box N			
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice	e?	Yes	No No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	at a all a star?		
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo du <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g(1) - g(3)$ <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> $g(1)$		∐ Yes	∐ No
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 nutrition?	ormal batching rate	and \Box Ves	🗌 No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching durat			
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a du			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (_	—
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration			∐ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this s		Ves	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		Yes	No No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-mi	nute average.	_	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?		Yes	□ No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.			

Emissions Unit Section <u>4 –cement storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 12/5/2008	(check 🗹 box for each d	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 fort even of event in the set of the past 4 within 20 days of event set. 	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 12/30/2009 	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 	⊠ 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	□ 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 o	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% 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? \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>32.5</u> tons/hourg. 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
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 collector onducted 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?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>5.6</u> % 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>32.5</u> tons/hour. 		No No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	
	(check \mathbf{v} only one box for each question)
	box for each 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
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (wit	h the exception of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such	
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same faci	ility? 🗌 Yes 🖾 No
If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	
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?	Xes No
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 belo	w)? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No
col discol/um - col cosoline/um - MM SCE not cos/um -	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}$ and propose $k_{\rm m} < 1.002$
<u>gal diesel/yr</u> + <u>gal gasoline/yr</u> + <u>MM SCF nat. gas/yr</u> + <u>275,000 gal diesel/yr</u> 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3	
275,000 gar droser/yr $25,000$ gar gasonno/yr 44 whyr SCP flat. gas/yr 1.5	wiwi gai propane/yi
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of month	hly fuel consumption
for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	

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
 a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? 		
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 permit and Department rules?		🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary [X]; relocatable []; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable []	(check ☑ box for each	
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the following	ng question 2.)	1
 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?		🗌 No
 b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900 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(🗌 Yes	🗌 No
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: 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?		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES	(check ☑ box for each	•
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent		1
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility of authorized represent associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	nits or 🗌 Yes	⊠ No □ No

110	w of woomed rocess Equipment of Change in Ownership.		
3.	Since the last registration form submittal has there been		
	a. Installation of any new process equipment?	🛛 Yes	No No
	b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	🖂 No
	c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?	Yes	🛛 No
	d. A change in ownership?	Yes	🛛 No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submit	tted	
	30 days prior to the change?	🛛 Yes	No No

Michael Storino, ESIII

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

11/30/2010

COMMENTS: INS3. Michael Storino inspected the facility and observed visible emissions compliance testing. OBSERVATIONS: EU 001 grey cement silo; ~25.92 tons cement from 2:31 pm to 3:22 pm. EU 004 white cement silo; ~24.39 tons cement from ~12:00 pm to ~12:30 pm. For EU 004: EMissions observed from the pressure relief valve; bags were clogged; cleaned bags -> restarted test -> still emissions (reduced) from relief valve. Facility will need to conduct maintenance on baghouse/ relief valve -> retest for compliance w/ the visible emissions std.