

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	(CI)
AIRS ID#: 0710261 DATE: 11/9 & 12/14/11 ARRIVE:	DEPART:
FACILITY NAME: BONITA SPRINGS BLOCK PLANT	
FACILITY LOCATION: 25091 OLD US HWY 41 S	
BONITA SPRINGS 34135-	
Email: Mobile:	(813)367-9780 (239)992-1400
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT	Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING  1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):  Brief Notes:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Representative still BILLY BRASWELL?	X YesNo
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days?  3. Is the facility contact still WAYNE BENNER?	
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	

# Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-BlockPlt,silo(cement)E compartment w/dustcollector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

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 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? — Yes No N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.  e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? — Yes No  f. What was the silo loading rate? — tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? — Yes No  2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? — tons/hour. What was the batching duration? — minutes  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? — tons/hour. What was the batching duration? — minutes  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? — minutes  2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? — Yes No	1. 1 2. 1 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Date of last inspection: 12/15/10 Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:  a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	☐ Yes	only one question)  No No No No No No No No
enclosed storage and conveying equipment    No for each question   box for each question   box for each question   box for each question   conducted   conducted				
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? ———————————————————————————————————	PA			only one question)
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li></ul>	1.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?			Yes	☐ No
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate?  Yes  No  N/A – silo not loaded during inspection.  e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?  Yes  No  f. What was the silo loading rate? 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 h.  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 and duration?  Yes  No  3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes  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?  No  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?  Yes  No		e. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?				
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  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 h.  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 and duration?  Yes  No 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes 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? Yes  No 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?  Yes  No		e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	_	☐ No
duration?		1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	☐ Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes  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? Yes No 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?				☐ No
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? Yes 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? Yes No	]			
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?		from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll	ector	□ No
	,	2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute	es.	
	;	a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ 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. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	(	e. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No

# Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-BlockPlt,silo(cement)W compartment w/dustcollector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	Yes         □ N           Yes         □ N           Yes         □ N	No No
	Yes	Мо
d. Date of last VE test: 12/15/10		
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? 30 tons/hour		No No
	=	No No
	Yes	No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other (check	only one	box
enclosed storage and conveying equipment fol	r each 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
	Yes	No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conduct that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🗵 Yes 🔲 No 🔲 N/A – silo not loaded du		ı.
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		No
	Yes 🛛 N	10
		No
duration?  3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minutes		10
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is se from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector	parate	
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? minutes.	Yes 🛛 N	10
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?		Vо По
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 24.7 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes	No

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-Block Plt cement weigh hopper w/dust collector subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	
Date of last inspection:  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 ☐ 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	only one question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:		
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 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 particulate matter?	- Yes	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li><li>□ No</li></ul>
<ul><li>4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?</li><li>b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?</li></ul>		□ 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?  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No

### **Facility Section (continued)**

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 or for each q	
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 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 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?		No     No     No     No     No     No     No     No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the self-yr 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal diesel/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal diesel/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal diesel/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal diesel/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 24,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal propagation of the self-yr 24,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal gas propagation of the self-yr 24,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal gas propagation of the self-yr 24,000 gal gasoline/yr + 1.3 MM gal gas propagation of the self-yr 24,000 gal gas propagation	<u>pane/yr</u> < 1.00 ne/yr	0?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumers for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption 	⊠ No
GI	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check or for each q	
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?	Yes	⊠ 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 permit and Department rules?		⊠ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:  1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both sta	tionary and relocatable	(check ☑ box for each	-
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If a</i>		g question 2.)	
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
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Lo         e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day pr</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification</li> </ul>	ior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification	s days following a relocation? on Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	Yes	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five by  3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air	-		∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpo If YES, what was the purpose?	that separate permit: se (i.e, there is no repeated usage		⊠ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it w co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?			☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES		(check <b>☑</b> box for each	
Administrative Changes:  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 of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the associated with a change in the associ		tive not	1
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> </ol>	of the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility?	tive not its or -  Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	of the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change?	tive not its or - Yes - Yes Yes Yes	No     No     No     No     No     No
Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.  If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:  Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	of the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change?  thin in the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change?	tive not its or - Yes - Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	of the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change? ntially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	tive not its or -	No
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? —         <ul> <li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? —</li> <li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substant d. A change in ownership? —</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the answer to any question 3a. — d. is YES, was a new registration</li> </ol>	of the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change? ntially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	tive not its or - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes mitted	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	of the facility or any emissions un strative change at the facility? the change? ntially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	tive not its or - Yes - Yes - Yes - Yes mitted	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administs.</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:</li> <li>Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?</li></ol>	of the facility or any emissions unstrative change at the facility? the change? ntially different? form and the appropriate fee sub	tive not its or -	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>