

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INS	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)  RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE ARMS COMPLAINT No	` /				
AIF	RS ID#: 0951232 DA	ГЕ: <u>7/20/11</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:00 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>10:38 AM</u>				
FACILITY NAME: OLDCASTLE PRECAST								
FA	FACILITY LOCATION: 690 W TAFT-VINELAND RD							
		ORLANDO 32824						
CO I	OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Mike Kovalick/General Manager PHONE: (239)872-3266  Email: Mobile:  CONTACT NAME: PHONE:  Email: Mobile:  ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/10/2006 / 8/10/2011  (effective date) (end date)							
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE								
1. ]		resentative(s): Mike Kovalick		(check ☑ only one box for each question)				
2. ]	Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?: <u>Mike</u>	esentative still LAURA SMIT <u>Kovalick</u>	H?	Yes \(\sigma\)No				
3. ]	If different, did the facts the facility contacts of the facility contact states on the factor of th	ility provide an administrative till?	update within 30 days?	☐ Yes ☐No ☐ Yes ☐No				
4. '	Will facility be conduc		inspection?15 days in advance?					

## Emissions Unit Section 1 -New Concrete Batch Plant subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 6/24/10 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
<ul><li>a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?</li><li>b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?</li><li>c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing</li></ul>	
operation? N/A  d. Date of last VE test: 6/24/10	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>25.5</u> 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  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes ☐ No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE to If not, what was the problem (if known)?	est? 🛚 Yes 🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 only one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	Yes No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the state is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ✓ Yes ✓ No ✓ N/A – silo no	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector' <i>If YES, then continue on to questions</i> $g.1) - g.3$ ) <i>below. If answer NO, then skip</i> $g.1) - g.3$ ) <i>and</i>	
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 batch duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? 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) du conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and dur 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	ration? 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?	
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? 27.49 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	No

## **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?  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.)?  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 gener 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	<ul><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li><li>No</li></ul>	
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propared 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propared 1.3 MM g		?	
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?	ption - X Yes	☐ No	
	ENERAL CONDITIONS			
Gı	SNERAL CONDITIONS	(check <b>☑</b> box for each of		
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?		☐ 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?		☐ No	

RELOCATABLE PLANT: (check ☑ only one				
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable □ concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If only stationary</i> , <i>skip the follow</i> )	box for each	question)		
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		☐ No		
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone,</li> <li>e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?</li> <li>b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.90</li> </ul>	Yes	☐ No		
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900]	Yes	☐ No		
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation	n?  Yes	☐ No		
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation p 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 usa If YES, what was the purpose?  b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was		□ No		
co-located at the permitted facility?  If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No		
		'		
CHANGES  Administrative Changes:	(check <b>☑</b> box for each			
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represer associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> <li>If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?</li></ol>	units or X Yes	□ No ⊠ No		
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 different? d. A change in ownership?	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No ⊠ No		
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee s 30 days prior to the change?	submitted Yes	☐ No		
Norma Ali 7/20/11				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)  Date of Inspection				
12/31/12				
Inspector's Signature Approximate Date of Next	Inspection			

**COMMENTS:** Inspector Norma Ali met with Mike Kovalick, General Manager and David Jones, Visual Emission Evaluator to audit the VE compliance test conducted on this date. Opacity observerd was zero percent. Loading rate was 27.49 tons/hr.

Roads are paved. No objectionable odors or dust leaving the property were observed. Facility appeared to be in compliance at the time of inspection. The Inspector requested to Mr. Kovalick to notify EPD, that he is the new facility representative, which he did via e-mail.