

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
AIRS ID#: 0950221 DATE: <u>8/5/2014</u> ARRIVE: <u>8:52 AM</u> DEPART:	9:55 AM					
FACILITY NAME: ALLIED PRECAST						
FACILITY LOCATION: 5640 Carder Rd						
ORLANDO 32810-4704						
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: BANNER THOMAS Email: CONTACT NAME: BANNER THOMAS Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 10/3/2009 / 10/3/2014 (effective date) (end date) PHONE: (407)293-85 Mobile: Mobile:						
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
DADT II. ONCUTE INTRODUCTORY MEETING						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Banner Thomas	(check ☑ only one box for each question)					
Brief Notes:						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still BANNER THOMAS?	⊠ Yes □No					
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still BANNER THOMAS? If no, who is?:	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?						

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-2 silos(cement)#1&2 interconnected w/cent.baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 6/2/2014 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		
	 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)? 	⊠ Yes	□ No		
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS 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 conducted at a rate				
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		Dection.		
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>47.47</u> 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			
	 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 		∐ No		
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No		
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	n is separate			
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? minut	? 🗌 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 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? 47.47 tons/hour. 		□ No		

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		only one h 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? 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 ☐ 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.)?		⊠ 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? 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 below)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared		00?	
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	nption - 🛭 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?		⊠ No	
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?	_	□ 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		□ No	

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?	stationary and relocatable box for each	only one ch question)
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 e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification 	Local Air Program by telephone, y prior to changing location? Yes ication Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	□ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	 No No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions uni a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine put If YES, what was the purpose?	it in that separate permit:	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:		only one ch question)
 Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admits. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 	on of the facility or any emissions units or ninistrative change at the facility? Yes	⊠ No □ No
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 subd. A change in ownership?	?? Yes stantially different? Yes	⋈ No⋈ No⋈ No⋈ No
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrat 30 days prior to the change?		☐ No
Ilka Bundy	8/5/2014	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)		
	Date of Inspection	
(Date of Inspection 12/31/2015	

COMMENTS: Inspector Ilka Bundy met with Joseph Stine, consultant, and Sara Greivell, VE reader from Grove Scietific and Engineering, on 8/5/2014 to audit the facility's second compliance test for 2014. This test was conducted to satisfy a compliance assistance offer since the facility missed the 2013 annual compliance test. No emissions were observed. No objectionable odors were detected. The loading rate was 47.47 tons per hour (acceptable). Banner Thomas, R.O., was also present during the compliance test. This facility has the mix drop into a mobile bucket and is poured into molds in the casting area.