

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<u>IN</u>	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	· · · —					
ΑI	RS ID#: 0951307 DA 7	ГЕ: <u>12/17/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>7:30 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>11:30 AM</u>					
FA	FACILITY NAME: LOTT'S CONCRETE PRODUCTS								
FA	CILITY LOCATION	: 429 HENNIS RD							
		WINTER GARDEN	34787-2407						
CC	WNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: DNTACT NAME: Ri Email: VTITLEMENT PERIC		Mobi PHO Mobi	NE:					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ✓ only one box) ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE									
	ART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING Name(s) of facility representative(s): Rick Higgins Brief Notes:		•						
2.	Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?:	esentative still ?		X Yes	□No				
3.		ility provide an administrative till ?			□No □No				
4.		ting VE test(s) during today's i nce authority notified at least 1			□No □No				

Emissions Unit Section 1 -Concrete Batch Plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one				
1. D	box for each question)				
1. Date of last inspection: 6/5/2007	•				
Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests: a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Yes No				
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	les No				
operation? 🔯 N/A	A Yes No				
d. Date of last VE test: <u>12/19/2006</u>					
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? 26.38 tons/hour					
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state	e				
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? 🛛 N/A	A 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 VI	E test? ⊠ Yes □ 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 question)				
	son 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 2.1 % 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)?					
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate					
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loaded during inspectio					
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?					
f. What was the silo loading rate? 31.9 tons/hour					
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collec					
If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ a					
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 ba					
duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	minutes I es I NO				
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collec					
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher)					
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and					
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	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?					
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\frac{1.25}{2}$ % 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? 31.9 tons/hour.					

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?	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.)? 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 - ⊠ Yes - ⊠ Yes	 No No No No No No
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 T	•
GENERAL COMPANIONS	(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?	- X 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:		(check only one oox for each question)			
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?			• '		
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	☐ No		
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif 	y prior to changing location?		☐ No		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busi c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifi to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	5)]	□ No		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate	air construction or air operation per		1NO		
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose?		e)? 🗌 Yes	☐ No		
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?			☐ No ☐ No		
CHANGES (check ☑ only one box for each question)					
Administrative Changes: 1. 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 address. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions uninistrative change at the facility?	ative not hits or 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 replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	?stantially different?	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No		
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?	ion form and the appropriate fee sul	omitted \ Yes	☐ No		
Bill Rhodes	12/17/2011				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
	12/17/2012				

COMMENTS: OCEPD personnel, Bill Rhodes, arrived at the plant at approximately 7:00 AM to perform a VE test on the cement silo baghouse (EU-001). Noah A. Handley, P.E., the consultant, representing Arlington Environmental Services, Inc., was also present, as well as Mr. Rick Higgins, V.P. Sales, with Lott's Concretre. A baghouse controls the emissions for the cement silo. No batching operations are performed. The truck was already present prior to OCEPD arrival, and contained 27.17 tons of cement to off-load. A 30-minute VE was performed, however the tanker was stopped due to silo capacity exceedence, evidenced by release from the blowoff valve, with approximately 1-2 minutes remaining in the VE test. Emissions were observed and resulted in 6-minute average opacity of 2.1%. To validate the reason for exceedence, the silo was depleted to acceptable levels, enough to contain the remainder of the tanker truck, which was approximately 1/3 of the load or 1-pod. The remainder of the truck was off-loaded with

no visible emissions observed Loading rate was determined to be 31.9 TPH, which is acceptable. It should be noted that no dust was observed leaving the property.