

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

NSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)						
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 7775767 DATE: <u>3/4/2014</u> ARRIVE: <u>10:00</u> DEPART:	12.:10					
FACILITY NAME: FLORIDA EAST COAST RR @ PORT EVERGLADES						
FACILITY LOCATION: 4301 McIntosh rd						
FORT LAUDERDALE 33316						
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: WILLIAM GRAY Email: wgray@agpeltz.com CONTACT NAME: TOM BENENAZQUISTO Email: tbenenazquisto@agpeltz.com ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/8/2013 / 6/8/2018 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (205)849-156 Mobile: (205)849-156 (205)849-156 Mobile: (205)440-956	17 59					
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING	(check ☑ only one					
Name(s) of facility representative(s):	box for each question)					
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still WILLIAM GRAY?	⊠ Yes □No					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still TOM BENENAZQUISTO? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐No					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant: baghouse on top of silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION				
PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 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?	 Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes 	 No 		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment				
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	☐ No		
ϵ	⊠ Yes	☐ No		
 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?	⊠ Yes	☐ No		
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 loade e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		ection.		
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26</u> 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 h.	∐ Yes	⊠ No		
	☐ Yes	☐ No		
duration?	☐ Yes	☐ No		
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minute h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which is				
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collect	ctor	_ ,,		
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		∐ No		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		☐ No ☐ No		
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % 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? tons/hour.	⊠ Yes	☐ No		

Emissions Unit Section 2 -CCB Plant: central dust collector subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection:		1,
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ v	□ N.
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?	Yes	∐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? ————————————————————————————————————	☐ Yes	☐ No
 d. Date of last VE test: n/a e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? 		□ 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	∐ 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? N/A	∐ Yes	∐ No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?		∐ 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 VE test If not, what was the problem (if known)?	?	∐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check ☑	only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	•
	box for cuch	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 $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	⊠ v	□ N.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X 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	o conducted at a r	rate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		□ 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 $g.3$		
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 batchin	g rate and	_
duration?		☐ 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 w		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust		□ N.
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durat		☐ No
 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? continuous 2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? 		□ No
a. Was the 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 EFA Method 9?b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}$ % for the highest six-minute average.	🖂 168	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	X Yes	☐ No
d. What was the process rate? n/a tons/hour.	Z 105	

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		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 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?	-	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
1	12000 gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal properties (23,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal properties the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumers.	ne/yr)?
†	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	- X Yes	□ No
Gl	ENERAL 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
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	- X 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?	- X 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:	(check ✓	only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ☐; relocatable ☒; or consisting of both s concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>Ij</i>		•
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.)		⊠ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or I e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day j b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifical 	orior to changing location? Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busine c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	ss days following a relocation? Yes tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	☐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five		⊠ No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate a and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purp If YES, what was the purpose?	in that separate permit:	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it co-located at the permitted facility?	was 	□ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes	☐ No
<u>CHANGES</u>	(check $lacksquare$ box for each	•
 Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of t associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admir 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the same o	he facility or authorized representative not of the facility or any emissions units or histrative change at the facility? Yes	⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	of the change?	☐ N0
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantial. A change in ownership?	Yes antially different? Yes	NoNoNoNoNo
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		☐ No
Patricia Tampas	March 4, 2014	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: This relocatable plant is operated by A.G Peltz, a company based in Alabama, who was contracted by East Coast Rail. They were currently laying concrete for a container storage yard at Port Everglades. They operated a compact roller concrete system to pave the area with material being made on site with an Aran continuous mixing pugmill plant.. After the concrete was mixed, it travels on a conveyor to drop into dump trucks to be transported to the location on the property. This plant has the capacity rating of 500 tons per hour. There is a baghouse on the silo to control dust as the silo is being filled (approximately 12 to 15 times per day). There is a central baghouse that collectes dust pulled from the silo baghouse discharge and the pug mill. The facility started operations on 1/23/2014, but ran for only 17 days before the VE test because they left the site to complete another project delayed due to a winter storm. The facility contacts expect the job to run 12 weeks.