CHINERTAL PROTECTION	
our Van	
FLORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DIS	· · · <u> </u>	
AIRS ID#: 0950058 DA	TE: <u>2/25/14</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1:55 PM</u>	DEPART:	<u>3:10 PM</u>
FACILITY NAME: A1	BLOCK-ORLANDO			
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 1617 S Division Ave			
	ORLANDO 32805-4'	725		
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: adam@a1blo CONTACT NAME: A Email: adam@a1blo ENTITLEMENT PERIC	DAM FREEMAN* ck.com	M P M	HONE: (407)422-376 Iobile: HONE: (407)422-376 Iobile:	
PART I: INSPECTION	<u>COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (d	_	IFICANT Non-COMPL	IANCE
	RODUCTORY MEETING presentative(s): <u>Brad Coolidge</u>			(check ☑ only one box for each question)
2. Is the Authorized Rep. If no, who is?:	resentative still ADAM FREEM	IAN*?		YesNo
	cility provide an administrative still ADAM FREEMAN*?			☐ Yes ☐No ⊠ Yes ☐No
	cting VE test(s) during today's i ance authority notified at least 1			⊠ Yes □No □ Yes ⊠No

Emissions Unit Section <u>4 -CONCRETE BLOCK PLANT 4 CEMENT SILO 4A subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
1. Date of last inspection: 2/18/14 2. Date Visible Environment (VE) tester	box for each	question)
 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 for the performed is the performed within the current calendar year?	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 4/6/11 	Tes Yes	🗌 No
 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? <u>27.16</u> tons/hour 	\boxtimes Yes \boxtimes Yes	□ No □ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No
 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)? 	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
DADT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a sile, weigh hoppon(batchon) on other		
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each	only one 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 <u>0</u> % 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 co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? 🛛 Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection.
f. What was the silo loading rate? 25.65 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		No No
 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate 	te and	∐ No
duration?	tes	🗌 No
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust colle		
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? minute	Yes	🗌 No
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?		□ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u>% 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? <u>25.65</u> tons/hour. 		□ No
$\frac{1}{25.05}$ to is not in process rate: $\frac{25.05}{25.05}$ to is not in		

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	
	(check \mathbf{M} only one box for each question)
	1 ,
1. Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emi	
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
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general per	mit (with the exception of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule	
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit wh	e
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the sa If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	ame facility? 🗌 Yes 🛛 No
If TES, what other general permit units of activities?	
3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or ea	qual 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	ion below)? Xes No
and disculture to and manifestive to MOUSCE not anatom	MM asl manage /m < 1.002
<u>gal diesel/yr</u> + <u>gal gasoline/yr</u> + <u>MM SCF nat. gas/yr</u> 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr	+ <u>MM gal propane/yr</u> $\leq 1.00?$
275,000 gar $dreset/yr = 25,000$ gar gasonno/yr = 44 whith SCF flat. gas/yr	1.5 white gat propanely yr
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?	

GENERAL 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
 Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition? 		
 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? 3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access 		🗌 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 box for each question)
1. Is the facility: stationary 🖾; relocatable 🛄; or consisting of both stationary a concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only state</i>)	
 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	Yes No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air I e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to ch b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form 	Yes No n [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days fo c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business of	[DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construct and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e. the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine plant being us	parate permit:
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, t If YES, what was the purpose?b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was	here is no repeated usage)? 🗌 Yes 🔛 No
co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes No 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	box for each question) or authorized representative not
Administrative Changes:	box for each question) or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? Yes X No
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the face operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative of 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the chan <u>New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership</u>: 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 substantially discussed. 	box for each question) r or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? Yes No nge? Yes No Yes No Yes No fferent? Yes No
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the face operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative of 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the chan 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?	box for each question) or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No fferent? Yes No Yes No
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the face operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative of 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the chan 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?	box for each question) or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No fferent? Yes No Yes No
 <u>Administrative Changes</u>: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the face operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative of 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the chan 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?	box for each question) or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No fferent? Yes No Yes No
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative of 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the chanter 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?	box for each question) or authorized representative not cility or any emissions units or change at the facility? Yes No mge? Yes No Yes No Yes No fferent? Yes No d the appropriate fee submitted Yes No

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: The EPD inspector, Norma Ali, met with Brad Coolidge, facility representative and Bruno Ferraro, consultant from Grove Scientific to audit the visual emission test on EU 004 4A. This emission unit has been removed from Long Term Reserve Shutdown and is now active. The 15-day notice was waived by OCEPD. Opacity observed = 0% Loading rate of 25.65 TPH. No objectionable odors noted or PM was observed leaving the property. Facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection.