

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
AIRS ID#: 0690066 DATE: <u>01/11/2012</u> ARRIVE: <u>1:45 P.M.</u> DEPART	: <u>2:15 P.M.</u>				
FACILITY NAME: MACK CONCRETE INDUSTRIES INC					
FACILITY LOCATION: 23902 COUNTY RD 561					
ASTATULA 34705					
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: GREG LISKEY Email: gknotts@mackconcrete.com CONTACT NAME: Email: Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 11/5/2007 / 11/5/2012 (effective date) (end date)	333				
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Greg Knotts Brief Notes: See Inspection report attached below.	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)				
2. Is the Authorized Representative still GREG LISKEY?	⊠ Yes □No				
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still?					
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?					

Emissions Unit Section 1 –TWO CEMENT SILOS subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ✓ box for each	only one question)
	Date of last inspection: 11/06/2008 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity?	TYes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
Uı	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. nconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and onveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfigurations by:	ined	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	X 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? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?	. - 	☐ No
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	X Yes	☐ No
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		□ No □ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –FLYASH SILO subject to Reasonable Precautions

	2 -F2 FASTI SILO Subject to Reasonable Freeducions		
PA	ART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ✓ box for each	only one question)
	Date of last inspection: 11/06/2008 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
Ur	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. nconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Onveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfigurations by:	ined	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? 3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the 	X Yes	☐ No
	owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	. - 	□ No□ 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 <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

CO	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹	only one
		box for each	
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 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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No
	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 gal propared 1.5 MM g	<u>nne/yr</u> < 1.00 e/yr)?
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 Yes	☐ No
CI	ENERAL CONDITIONS		
<u> </u>	ENERAL 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
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?	S	□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants?		box for each ag question 2.)	•
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization? (If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	Yes	☐ No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department o e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business da b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notif 	y prior to changing location?		☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busic. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification to the empression Department or Local Air Program et leget fix	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	5)]	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate	e air construction or air operation per		∐ No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions un a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pu If YES, what was the purpose?	urpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage	e)? 🗌 Yes	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes	□ No □ No
<u>CHANGES</u>		(check ☑ box for each	
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of			
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocati operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions un ninistrative change at the facility?	nits or 	⊠ No □ No
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day	on of the facility or any emissions un ministrative change at the facility? 's of the change?	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	on of the facility or any emissions uninistrative change at the facility?	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	NoNoNoNoNoNo
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	on of the facility or any emissions uninistrative change at the facility?	Yes	No No No No No No
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is sub d. A change in ownership?	on of the facility or any emissions un ministrative change at the facility?	Yes	No No No No No No
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adr 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 day 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? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacemen c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership? 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registra 30 days prior to the change?	on of the facility or any emissions un ministrative change at the facility?	Yes	No No No No No No

COMMENTS: Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("Department") representative John Vigliotti, Engineering Specialists, visited the above mentioned facility in order to do a baseline Level 2-Compliance Inspection. The facility has been subject to the following rules: Method 9 V.E. testing Rule No. 62-296.413(2), F.A.C.; (thirty Min.), with a minuimum Silo Rate of 25 Tons/Hr. During Loading. Rule 62-210.300(3) F.A.C. (Rolling 12- Month fuel consumption, past five years). Rule 62-296.414(2) F.A.C. (Unconfined Field Emissions). The last V.E. was conducted on 08/31/2011 passing with a zero Opacity. Conversation with Greg Knotts, Sales and Manager for Mack Concrete Industries and a review of the files indicated that the facility had been operating at a low production rate now since the economy has taken a down turn. Further correspondence indicated that

none of the operations limits had been exceeded within the last 12 consecutive months. No changes in equipment, ownership or fuel types have been made.

Based on this inspection and further correspondence with supervisor Mr. Garry Kuberski, F.D.E.P., the facility was found to be in compliance.