



HEATING UNITS AND GENERAL PURPOSE INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINES



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☐ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☒
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ☐ ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 0951294 **DATE:** 10/3/06 **ARRIVE:** 10:00 AM **DEPART:** 11:30 AM

FACILITY NAME: E&H CAR CRUSHING CO INC

FACILITY LOCATION: 106 GLOUCESTER ST
ORLANDO 32833-3459

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Harold Erb

PHONE: (407)568-5865

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

REMITTANCE YEAR: **ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 1/15/2006 / 1/15/2011
(effective date) (end date)

PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☒ only one box)

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PART II: CONTROL TECHNOLOGY/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

- Does the facility operate any emissions units other than the heating units and general purpose internal combustion engines and emissions units which are exempt from permitting pursuant to the criteria of paragraph 62-210.300(3)(a), or (b), F.A.C., or have been exempted from permitting under Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)3.a., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Are these heating units or general purpose internal combustion engines subject to the Federal Acid Rain Program as defined at Rule 62-210.200, F.A.C.? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)3.b., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Were visible stack emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (40 CFR 60, Appendix A)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Pursuant to subparagraph 62-296.320(4)(b)1., F.A.C., are visible emissions from any heating unit(s) or general purpose internal combustion engine(s) equal to or greater than 20 percent opacity as designated as Number 1 on the Ringelmann Chart? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)3.c., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- What type of fuel is used by all heating units and general purpose internal combustion engines at this facility? (check ☒ only one box)
a) diesel fuel ☒ b) gasoline ☐ c) natural gas/propane ☐ d) multiple fuels ☐
- Is the total fuel consumption by all heating units and general purpose internal combustion engines within the facility limited to the following thresholds: (Chapter 62-210.300(3)(c)3.d., F.A.C.) (check ☒ only one box)
a) diesel fuel – 250,000 gallons/year (if diesel is the sole source of energy at this facility)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
b) gasoline – 22,000 gallons/year (if gasoline is the sole source of energy at this facility)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
c) natural gas/propane – 35m standard cubic feet (if gasoline is sole source of energy at this facility)?--- ☐ Yes ☐ No
d) multiple fuels – (equivalent prorated amount)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART II: CONTROL TECHNOLOGY/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300, F.A.C. (continued)

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

7. Does the owner/operator of the facility maintain records to document the fuel consumption, by type, for each emissions unit? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)3.e., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Does the owner/operator retain, and make available for Department inspection, these records for a period of at least five years? (Rule 62-210.300(3)(c)3.e., F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
9. Does the owner or operator voluntarily encourage pollution prevention through such measures as: (Rule 62-210.300(4)(b)2.b., F.A.C.)
- a) employing energy conservation measures to reduce the demand for heat from any heating units?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) performing regular maintenance of heating units to ensure efficient heat recovery?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- c) the use of, or considering the use of economizers to recycle waste heat back into the combustion air stream?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- d) improved operating procedures to reduce the load on any internal combustion engines?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- e) the use of, or considering the use of alternative fuels?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART III: GENERAL CONDITIONS/MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(e)6., 8., & 12., F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

1. Does the owner or operator make every reasonable effort to conduct the specific activity authorized by the general permit in a manner that minimizes adverse effects on adjacent property or on public use of the adjacent property, where applicable, and on the environment, including fish, wildlife, natural resources, water quality, or air quality?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Does the owner or operator maintain the permitted facility, emission unit, or activity in good condition? ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any applicable air pollution control devices?--- ☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Has the owner or operator allowed the emission of air pollutants as the result of the malfunction of, or inoperable condition of applicable air pollution control devices?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

A. New or Modified Process Equipment

1. Since the last inspection has there been
- a) installation of any new process equipment?----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?----- ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - d) If you answered **YES** to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, F.A.C.) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Tom Bessa

10/3/06

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: John Kasper, Cathy Evangelo, and Tom Bessa visited the site following a complaint of fugitive particulates from the metal shredder. Contact for E&H was Harold Erb who escorted the inspectors through the shredder operation. The shredder was in full operation at the time of the visit. A light haze of smoke and dust was seen immediately near the top of the shredder. Opacity was less than 20%. No smoke or dust was noted as going off the property. Mr. Erb stated they are installing a water spray system to suppress dust.

Regarding noise, Mr. Erb stated personnel from EPD had taken noise readings which were reportedly less than the allowable limit.

The inspectors drove to several locations of the nearest neighbors in a mobile home park south of the shredder. Stops were made at dead ends of two dirt roads. No smoke was detected from the shredder at these locations, however noise from the shredder could be clearly heard.

The shredder appeared to be in compliance with permit conditions at the time of inspection.