

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVER RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO.	· · · —						
AIRS ID#: 1050403 DATE: <u>11/28/2011</u> ARRIVE: <u>10:34 am</u>	DEPART: <u>10:43 am</u>						
FACILITY NAME: PRESTIGE CONCRETE PRODUCTSLAKELAND BATCH PI	LANT						
FACILITY LOCATION: 255 EDWARDS AVENUE							
LAKELAND 33815							
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Thomas Lang Email: CONTACT NAME: THOMAS LANG Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/17/2008 / 1/17/2013 (effective date) (end date)	: (407)802-3540 :						
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): NONE	(check 🗹 only one box for each question)						
Brief Notes: This facility was never built. This inspection confirmed the location is st	ill an empty lot.						
2. Is the Authorized Representative still MICHAEL MAHONEY?	Yes 🗵No						
If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? 3. Is the facility contact still THOMAS LANG? If no, who is?:							
4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?							

Emissions Unit Section Subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	
1. Date of last inspection: NONE		1
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	□ 3 7	⊠ N.
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? ————————————————————————————————————	☐ Yes	☐ No
d. Date of last VE test: NONE	□ 3 7	
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?		 No No
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?	U Yes	∐ No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	□ 3 7	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?-	- L 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	•
		4
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?	U Yes	∐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.	□ 3 7	□ N.
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	L Yes	☐ No
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 silo of	onducted at a ra	ate
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo		
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 t	Yes Yes	☐ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching in	_	_
duration?		☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min		
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector whi from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust co		
conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration		☐ No
2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minutes.		
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?		⊠ No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		☐ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.		
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: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 05/15/2009 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? C. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		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	only one question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:	ned	
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	Yes	□ No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	<u> </u>	□ 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?	Yes Yes	□ No □ No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	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.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air gene 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? 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)?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	NoNoNoNoNoNoNo
4.	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propagation of the past 5 years?	ne/yr)? □ No
	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 3 years:	- 🔲 ICS	
GI	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? b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all	- Yes	☐ No
3.	terms and conditions of the air general permit?	- Yes	☐ 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		question)
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ()
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 or e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificents. 	y prior to changing location? Yes	☐ No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busing c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificato the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five	cation Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	□ No□ No
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	air construction or air operation permit,	
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)? Yes	☐ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long is co-located at the permitted facility?	Yes	□ No □ No
CHANGES (check ☑ only one box for each question)		
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 relocation operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor adm 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days. New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	on of the facility or any emissions units or ninistrative change at the facility? Yes	□ No □ No
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is subd. A change in ownership?	t? Yes stantially different? Yes	NoNoNoNoNo
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registrat 30 days prior to the change?	ion form and the appropriate fee submitted Yes	☐ No
Wendy D. Akins	11/28/11	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	
	11/18/2013	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	

COMMENTS: This facility is still marked as under construction in ARM's. This inspection is to verify the facility has never been completed or operated. Inspection Findings: This facility has never been constructed. On November 30, 2011, I left a voicemail message for Mr. Thomas Lang at the corporate headquarters. In response to my voice mail on November 30th, a Mr. Bill Pagano contacted me to discuss this facility. According to Mr. Pagano, Prestige will send a letter to surrender this General Permit Entitlement. I provided Mr. Pagano with the address of our Tallahassee Receipts office and the contact name of Mr. Dick Dibble. Photos were taken of empty lot. See attached photo log.