CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Environmental Compliance

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

RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 7775579 **DATE:** 9/30/2009 **ARRIVE:** 7:15AM **DEPART:** 9:00AM

FACILITY NAME: GROUT PLANT-I-4 & MAITLAND BLVD

FACILITY LOCATION: I-4 AND MAITLAND BLVD

MAITLAND 32794

OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JON WIKSTEN **PHONE:** (813)909-8000

CONTACT NAME: JON WIKSTEN **PHONE:** 7273654870

ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 3/16/2009 (effective date) / 3/16/2014 (end date)

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

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.

(check ☑ appropriate box(es))

Stack Emissions

1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?---------- ☒Yes ☐ No
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?---------- ☒Yes ☐ No
3. 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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate, unless such rate is unachievable in practice?---------- ☒Yes ☐ No
4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is "No" then skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)---------- ☐Yes ☒ No
   a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests 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

PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – *(continued)*
(check ☑ appropriate box(es)

Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)

1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)---------- ☒Yes ☐ No

New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)

2. Did this facility demonstrate:
   a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?---------- ☐Yes ☒ No
   b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No

Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)

3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No

Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.)

4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed?---------- ☒Yes ☐ No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))

1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☐; 2) a relocatable ☒; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable ☐ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ***(Please check ☑only one box.)***

2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? ***(If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d),) below.)***---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel oil usage of all plants less than 240,000 gallons per calendar year?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   c) Is the quantity of material processed less than ten million tons per calendar year?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   d) Is the fuel oil sulfur content 0.5% by weight or less?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No

3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for:
   a) fuel consumption on a monthly basis?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   b) material processed on a monthly basis?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. *(continued)*
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))

Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)

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

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.

A. New or Modified Process Equipment

1. Since the last inspection 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 substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No
   d) If you answered **YES** to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?---------- ☐Yes ☐ No

Bill Rhodes	9/30/2009
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection
	9/30/2010
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Bill Rhodes, with OCEPD, arrived on-site at approximately 7:15 AM. Sara Greivell, representing Grove Scientific and Engineering, the consultant, arrived at appeoximately 7:30 AM. Jon Wiksten, Operations Manager, representing Earth Tech, as well as support personnel, were also on-site. OCEPD personnel and Mr. Wiksten discussed protocol of the day to include VEs on 4-emission points, as well as arrival time for two tanker trucks containing flyash and cement. The cement tanker was already on-site, prior to OCEPD arrival, and the second tanker, containing flyash, arrived at approximately 7:30 AM. Pumping commenced simultaneously at approximately 7:35 AM for both silos, and the mixer started at approximately 7:40 AM. Due to the nature of the operation, the mixer was started and stopped frequently, therefore the actual time of the VEs are suspect. Logged time amounted to approximately 18-minutes, that appears to be accurate. VEs were performed for 30-minutes with maximum opacities observed of 0%. The mixer area was partially enclosed with tarp and the auger was partially covered with visquine to mitigate migration of the cement/flyash from the area. While observing EU's 001-003, the diesel engine running the plant (EU-004) was also observed for emissions, and none were observed. During the operation, the flyash tanker was pumping into the pig and vented through the flyash silo baghouse as a control measure. The cement tankers' loading rate was 20.08 TPH, which is acceptable, due to the normal loading rate of the silo. The flyash silo loading rate was 40.65 TPH, which is an acceptable rate. The site contains 1-diesel engine which opearates the plant during working hours, 2-pumps which pump grout/cement/flyash mixture into the ground for sinkhole stabilization. The site also contains 4-generators which operate the ancillary equipment. The pig capacity is approximately 100-tons, and each silo has a capacity of approximately 50-tons. During the VEs, a water truck applied water to the site. No noticeable odors were observed, or dust leaving the property.