and the second se
1
1

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	(CI)	
AIRS ID#: 1270179 DA7	ГЕ: <u>01/24/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>10:30 A. M</u>	DEPART: <u>10:45 A.M.</u>	
FACILITY NAME: QU	ALITY GUNITE/JACOBS RD S	SILO		
FACILITY LOCATION	: 1492 JACOBS RD			
	DELAND 32724-2630			
OWNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: CONTACT NAME: Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIC		PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile: Facility may be operating with	nout Entitlement!	
Facility Section         PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box)         IN COMPLIANCE       MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE         SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
	RODUCTORY MEETING		(check $\square$ only one box for each question)	
1. Name(s) of facility representative(s):				
<ol> <li>Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?:</li> </ol>	esentative still ?		YesNo	
If different, did the fact 3. Is the facility contact st If no, who is?:	ility provide an administrative up till ?	date within 30 days?	YesNo YesNo	
		spection? days in advance?		

## **Emissions Unit Section** Subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check $\mathbf{M}$ only one box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection:	<b>-</b> .
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?	Yes No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation?	N/A Yes No
d. Date of last VE test:	
<ul> <li>e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?</li> <li>g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing?</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> </ul>	N/A Yes No
<ul> <li>j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour</li> <li>k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the las If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	st VE test? 🗌 Yes 🗌 No
DADT II. STACK EMISSIONS from a sile, weigh honnow(hotshon) on other	
PART II: <u>STACK EMISSIONS</u> from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check $\blacksquare$ 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 vis	isit? 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% for the highest six-minute a	
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opticity of is for the ingress of thinke e</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	
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? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A -	
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 co If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$	
<ol> <li>Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?</li> <li>During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal</li> </ol>	Yes No
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 co	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch	
<ul><li>conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate a</li><li>2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?</li></ul>	
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site v	
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute	
c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opticity of // for the inglisst six initiate	
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	

## **Emissions Unit Section** <u>Subject to Reasonable Precautions</u>

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

## Facility Section (continued)

C	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		1
		(check 🗹	•
		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?	TYes	□ No □ No
	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 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?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>If YES, what other general permit units or activities?</li> </ul>		🗌 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	□ No
	b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?		$\square$ No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?		
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?		🗌 No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	- 🗌 Yes	No No
	<u>gal diesel/yr</u> + <u>gal gasoline/yr</u> + <u>MM SCF nat. gas/yr</u> + <u>MM gal prop</u> 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propa	ne/yr	?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consur for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ box for each	only one 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
<ul><li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li></ul>	_	□ No
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acc</li> </ul>		🗌 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 ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary ; relocatable ; or consisting of both concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (a			-
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>		🗌 Yes	🗌 No
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifie	prior to changing location?		🗌 No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busin c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notific	ation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(	6)]	□ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five			L 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 unit a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine pur If YES, what was the purpose? h Were records then the the superformant to indicate here long is	t in that separate permit: pose (i.e, there is no repeated usag		🗌 No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES		(check 🗹	•
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of			
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation			$\square$ No
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes Xoo 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	or the enange.		
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		_	_
a. Installation of any new process equipment?		Yes	No No
<ul><li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement</li><li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subs</li></ul>			🛛 No 🖾 No
d. A change in ownership?			$\boxtimes$ No
4. If the answer to any question $3a d$ . is YES, was a new registration $2a + d = 1$			
30 days prior to the change?		🗌 Yes	No No
John Vigliotti	01/24/2012		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection		
	01/24/2017		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next In	spection	
COMMENTS: GUNITE/CONCRETE BATCH PLANT			

On, 01/24/2012 Mr. John Vigliotti visited the subject facility to perform a level 2 compliance Assistance inspection. Upon arrival, Mr. Vigliotti noticed that the address where the plant once was, was currently being occupied by a furniture store. There is no contact information either under ARMS or in GPCI to verify information with. Upon returning to the District Office, Mr. Vigliotti was instructed by the FDEP Supervisory Staff to finalize the report and mark as a Shut Down Facility. Also, Mr. Vigliotti was instructed to send an email along with this report to Mr. Jeff Ruskin Permitting Coordinator for FDEP and notify him of the status.

Based on the inspection, the facility was found to be in a shut down status.