	WEITUL PROTECTION	
NG.BI	1 Car	
E FI	ORIDA	

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



Xes Yes

...No

## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/ ARMS COMP		(CI)		
AIRS ID#: 0951307 DATI	E: <u>11/22/2013</u>	ARRIVE: <u>10:35</u>	5AM	DEPART: <u>1</u>	11:58AM	
FACILITY NAME: LOT	T'S CONCRETE PRODUCTS					
FACILITY LOCATION:	429 Hennis Rd					
	WINTER GARDEN 34	4787-2407				
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:RICK HIGGINSPHONE:(407)656-2112Email:Rick@lottsconcrete.comMobile:(407)468-1423CONTACT NAME:RICK HIGGINSPHONE:(407)656-2112Email:Rick@lottsconcrete.comMobile:(407)468-1423ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:3/12/2012 / 3/12/2017(end date)Mobile:(407)468-1423						
Facility Section						
	COMPLIANCE STATUS (cho		) )			
IN COMPLIANCE	E MINOR Non-COMPI	LIANCE S	GNIFICANT	Non-COMPLIA	ANCE	
PART II: ONSITE INTRO	DUCTORY MEETING			1	(check ☑ box for each c	only one
1. Name(s) of facility repre	sentative(s): Louis Baza			ı	)OX 10F each c	Juesuon)
Brief Notes: Foreman						
2. Is the Authorized Repres If no, who is?:	sentative still RICK HIGGINS?	<i>!</i>			Xes Yes	No
If different, did the facili	ity provide an administrative up	odate within 30 day	s?		Yes	No

	If no, who is?:		
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?	Xes Yes	No
	If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance?	🛛 Yes	No

3. Is the facility contact still RICK HIGGINS? -----

## **Emissions Unit Section**

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION         1. Date of last inspection: <u>12/12/2012</u>	(check 🗹 on box for each que	ly one stion)
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:		
		ът.
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		No
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: <u>12/12/2012</u>		
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?		] No ] No
<ul> <li>h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report s whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? I</li> <li>i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?</li> </ul>	N/A 🗌 Yes 🗌	] No ] 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 last If not, what was the problem (if known)?</li> </ul>	st VE test? 🛛 Yes 🗌	] No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	(check 🗹 on	ly one
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each que	-
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visi		] No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Xes	No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % for the highest six-minute avera</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>	rage	] No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading o	of the silo conducted at a rate	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\bigotimes$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ N/A –		ion.
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>35.92</u> tons/hour		110
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust coll If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$		] No
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 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 col		
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust col from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher)	ollector which is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate an	ollector which is separate her) dust collector and duration?  Yes X	] No
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate at 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	billector which is separate her) dust collector and duration?  Yes  Xes minutes.	-
<ul> <li>from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate at 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visible visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visible vi</li></ul>	billector which is separate her) dust collector and duration?  Yes minutes. /isit?  Yes	] No
<ul> <li>from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate at 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site via a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> </ul>	billector which is separate her) dust collector and duration? Yes minutes. tisit? Yes Yes	_
<ul> <li>from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batch conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate at 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?</li> <li>2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visible visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visible vi</li></ul>	billector which is separate her) dust collector and duration? Yes minutes. /isit? Yes age.	No

## Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY		
	(check ☑ box for each	
	DOX TOT Each	question)
<ol> <li>Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:         <ul> <li>a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant?</li> <li>b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants?</li> <li>c. 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	🛛 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
<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
<ul> <li>3. Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to:</li> <li>a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel?</li> <li>b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?</li> <li>c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?</li> <li>d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?</li> <li>e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?</li> </ul>	🛛 Yes 🖾 Yes 🖾 Yes	<ul> <li>□ No</li> <li>□ No</li> <li>□ No</li> <li>□ No</li> <li>□ No</li> </ul>
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yr+MM gal propriation275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal propriation		)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consu for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🛛 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	🖂 No
<ul> <li>2. Does the owner or operator:</li> <li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li> <li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li> </ul>		No
terms and conditions of the air general permit?		🗌 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:	(check ☑ box for each	•
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, skip the follows</i> )	ing question 2.)	- · ·
<ul> <li>2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, 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. 62-210.900]</li> </ul>		🗌 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		🗌 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?		🗌 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?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No
CHANGES Administrative Changes:	(check ☑ box for each	•
<ol> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represen associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? -</li> </ol>	inits or 🗌 Yes	

Ζ.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	<u> </u>	L NO
Ne	w 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 subm	itted	
	30 days prior to the change?	Yes	No No

Assefa Hailemariam

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

11/22/2013

Date of Inspection

before 12/31/2013.

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** Assefa Hailemariam, inspector from OCEPD, met with Zachary Beatty of Beatty Environmental Services, LLC, on November 22, 2013, at 429 Hennis Road, Winter Garden, Florida 34787 to audit the visible emission test on 001 emission unit and an observed opacity of zero percent and loading rates was 35.92 TPH. No objectionable odors were detected. No PM was observed leaving the property during the compliance test.