CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Environmental Compliance

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☒ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐

RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 7771354 **DATE:** 5/30/14 **ARRIVE:** 7:45 AM **DEPART:** 10:00 AM

FACILITY NAME: OUC STANTON ENERGY PLANT

FACILITY LOCATION: 5100 S Alafaya Trl

ORLANDO 32831-2005

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: SARA GREIVELL **PHONE:** (407)298-2282
Email: sara@grovescientific.com **Mobile:**
CONTACT NAME: BILLY BURKE **PHONE:** (352)266-3190
Email: **Mobile:** (352)728-5381
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 5/10/2014 (effective date) / 5/10/2019 (end date)

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 box for each question)

1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Billy Burke

   Brief Notes: Responsible Official

2. Is the Authorized Representative still SARA GREIVELL? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If no, who is?: _____
   If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Is the facility contact still BILLY BURKE? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If no, who is?: _____
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section

1 –Pre-Blending Plant & Associated Dust Collection System subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

1. Date of last inspection: _____
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. If tested: (_____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ------- ☐ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? _____

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

1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:

   a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following:
      1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
      2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
      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 ☒ No
      4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? ---------- ☐ 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 not being taken:
   a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   b. If tested: (_____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? _____

Emissions Unit Section

2 –350 Barrel Portable Silo. subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION (check ☑ only one box for each question)

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? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ 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 test? ------ ☐ Yes ☐ No
   f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   g. What was the actual silo loading rate? _____ tons/hour
   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? ---------- ☐ 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 VE test?-- ☐ Yes ☐ No
   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? ---------- ☒ 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 0 % 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? --- ☒ 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? 26.5 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? 10 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
   a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? ---------- ☒ 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. What was the process rate? 26.5 tons/hour.

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

(check ☑ only one 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   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 (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If YES, what non-exempt units or activities? _____

   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? ☐ 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? ☒ Yes ☐ No
   e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

$$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr}}{275{,}000\text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{gal gasoline/yr}}{23{,}000\text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44\text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3\text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$$

4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years? ☒ Yes ☐ 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? ☒ Yes ☐ 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? ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules? ☒ Yes ☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:

(check ☑ only one box for each question)

1. Is the facility: stationary ☐; relocatable ☒; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable ☐ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (***If only stationary, skip the following question 2.)***

2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)

a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? --------- ☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? ---- ☒ Yes ☐ No

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? --- ☒ Yes ☐ No

3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, 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)? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If YES, what was the purpose?

b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? ---------- ☒ Yes ☐ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ No

CHANGES

(check ☑ only one box for each question)

Administrative Changes:

1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? ---- ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:

3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been
   a. Installation of any new process equipment? ---------- ☐ Yes ☒ 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 submitted 30 days prior to the change? ---------- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Ilka Bundy	5/30/2014
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
	12/31/2015
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Ilka Bundy, OCEPD inspector, met with Bruno Ferraro, consultant, of Grove Scientific & Engineering, and Eric Snow, Senior Project Manager, of Tetra Tech and Billy Burke, Responsible Official (R.O.), of Blue Diamond Materials. Blue Diamond Materials received an initial General Permit for a concrete batch plant on 5/10/2014. It should be noted that GPCI has put Sara Greivell of Grove Scientific & Engineering as the R.O. on the GPCI checklist. The inspector informed Bruno Ferraro of the error. After reviewing the State's database, Sara Greivell is listed as the GP Correspondence Contact and Billy Burke is listed as the Facility Contact and Owner. The State's database will be revised to fix the R.O. issue, if possible. This pug mill is currently located at OUC, 0950137, for a non-routine project. Blue Diamond Material is subcontracted by Tetra Tech for installation of two stormwater ponds at OUC. The diesel fuel usage for the project will be e-mailed to the inspector once the project has been

completed. Emission unit 001 is subject to the general limiting standard (20%) and emission unit 002 is the portable silo with a dust collector mounted on the top of the silo. EU 002 is subject to 5% opacity. The loading rate was 26.5 tons per hour. No visible emissions were observed. No objectionable odors were detected. Most of the yard was wet down from a water truck. The facility is in compliance with the air general permit at this time.