	NUMERTAL PROTEC	TION	ic.
BI GHI	V	A rea	
FI	ORIDA	ar	1
			-

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS RE-INSPECTIO			
AIRS ID#: 7775368 DATE: <u>4/19/12</u>	ARRIVE:	DEPART:	
FACILITY NAME: CONCRETE ON DE	EMAND		
FACILITY LOCATION: 11715-2	PHILIPS HIGHWAY		
JACKSO	ONVILLE 32256-1643		
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: KRISTINN VOJNOVSKI PHONE: (904)813-1861 Email: Mobile: CONTACT NAME: PHONE: Email: Mobile: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 11/24/2006 / 11/24/2011 Facility may be operating without Entitlement! (effective date) (end date)			
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check I only one box) IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
 PART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY N</u> 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brief Notes: 		(check 🗹 only one box for each question)	
 Is the Authorized Representative still K If no, who is?: 	RISTINN VOJNOVSKI?	YesNo	
If different, did the facility provide an a 3. Is the facility contact still ?	dministrative update within 30 days?	YesNo YesNo YesNo	
 Will facility be conducting VE test(s) du If yes, was the compliance authority not 			

Emissions Unit Section Subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check \square only one box for each question)
1. Date of last inspection:	box for each question)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	Ves No
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	
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:	
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?	LYes LNo
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? 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	Yes No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	🗌 Yes 🗌 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 to	est? 🗌 Yes 🗌 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	
	(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?	🗌 Yes 📋 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	TYes No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average	
c. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	
If not, what was the problem (if known)?	
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the s	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \Box Yes \Box No \Box N/A – silo no	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	Yes No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector	
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.
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	ing rate and
duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	minutes
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector	
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?	
 What was the backing face: tons/nou?. What was the backing duration? 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?	
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute averag	
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes No
d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.	

Emissions Unit Section Subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	
	ľ
	ľ
	ľ
1. Date of last inspection:	ľ
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection?	□ No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? Yes	\square No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions $< 20\%$ opacity? \square N/A \square Yes	∐ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	ľ
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u>	ľ
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined	
emissions by:	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following:	
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? Yes	No No
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to	<u> </u>
control emissions? 🗌 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? Yes	□ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	<u> </u>
particulate matter from stock piles? Yes	∐ 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)? Yes	l No
b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? [Yes	No No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 only one
	box for each question)
	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?	
c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?	
e roo tons per year of more of any other regulated an ponutant?	
2. Does this facility include:	
a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the	exception of
units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or
Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)?	Yes No
If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?	
b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such othe	r air ganaral
permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?	
If YES, what other general permit units or activities?	
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)?	
c. Of an equivalent profaced amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below): -	
gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM	I gal propane/yr $< 1.00?$
275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM g	
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fu	
for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	Yes No

GENERAL 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	
 a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		
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?3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access		🗌 No
to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No

RELOCATABLE PLANT: 1. Is the facility: stationary]; relocatable]; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable] concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the follows)	(check 🗹 box for each ing question 2.	question)
 2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900])(6)]	□ 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] to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation 	(6)]	☐ No
 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per 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 usage If YES, what was the purpose? 	ermit,	No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility? If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	•

110	diministrative Changes.	
1.	Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not	
	associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or	
	operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
2.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change? 🗌 Yes	No No
Ne	ew 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? Yes	🗌 No
	b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? Yes	🗌 No
	c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different? Yes	🗌 No
	d. A change in ownership? Yes	🗌 No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted	
	30 days prior to the change? Yes	🗌 No

William Coffman

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

4/19/12

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: Facility is no longer at this location. No equip on site, some concrete rubble.