

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INS	INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ⊠ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) □						
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:							
FA	CILITY: B.E.T.ER Mix, Inc.	DISTRICT:					
DB	A/Site Name: Largo Plant	Southwest					
AD	DRESS: 2063 20th Avenue S.I	CONTACT PHONE:					
	Largo, FL		727-862-2239				
ARMS NO:		PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 3/5/2014				
1030036 002		1030036-007-AG	Renewal Date: 2/3/2014				
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Cement Silo No. 1 controlled by a C&W Manufacturing and Sales Co. Model CP-305							
Baghouse							
INS	SPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check □ only one box)					
3-	-5-12	☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Compl	liance; Significant l	Non-Compliance			
		PART I: General Review:					
1.	Permit File Review			Yes No			
2.	Introduction and Entry			⊠Yes □ No			
	Comments: A dive by inspection was performed at the facility. The emission unit was not in operation and the entrance was padlocked. According to Mr. Jackson the facility Representative stated the emission unit last operated in February 2012. He stated the emission unit has not operated since February 2012 because their concrete business has been was very slow. He stated they are scheduled to perform annual visible emissions test on April 17, 2012.						
3.	Is the Authorized Representative still Terry White?						
	Comments: Terry White is stills the Authorized Representative.						
4.	Is the facility contact still Chuck Jackson? ⊠Yes □ No						
	Comments: Chuck Jackson stills the Authorized contact.						
5.	If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]						
PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check — appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)							
Compliance Demonstration 1. New Facilities / New Process Equipment— (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits) Did this facility demonstrate initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation? Yes No							
2.							
	Test Reports Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit?						
4.	Was the department notified at least 15	5 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A	A. C.]	⊠ Yes □ No			
5.	Was the required test report filed with test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b)	the department as soon as practical, but no late	er than 45 days after the	e ⊠ Yes □ No			
6.	6. Was the facility visible emissions test(s) conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-297.401(9)(c), F.A.C] Yes No						
	7. 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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,						

DADE II. TECTING DECLIDEMENTS. DL. (2 200 A1A E A C					
PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)					
unless such rate is unachievable in practice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.]					
uniess such rate is unactievable in practice: [02-290.414(5), 1.A.C.]					
8. Are emissions from a weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer					
to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 8.a) and 8.b) below. If answer is "No" then skip to question 9.)					
a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? [62-296.414(3(c)), F.A.C.]					
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [62-296.414(3)(c), F.A.C.]					
9. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector while batching					
at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [62-296.414(3)(d), F.A.C.] Yes No					
10. Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according to EPA Method 9? Yes No					
a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six minute average. b) Did the test indicate the facility is operating in compliance with the 5% opacity standard?					
b) But the test thatcute the factility is operating in compitance with the 570 opacity standard:					
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.					
(check [] appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)					
1. Is this facility: 1) a \square stationary; 2) a \square relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, \square stationary and relocatable					
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check \Box only one box.)					
2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concrete batching plants					
or nonmetallic mineral processing plants:					
a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility? [62-210.310(5)(b)4.a., F.A.C.] \square Yes \square No					
b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to the fuel usages					
listed below: [62-210.310(5)(b)4.b., F.A.C.]					
1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals gallons					
2) 23,000 gallons of gasoline – usage equals gallons					
3) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas — usage equals cubic feet 4) 1.3 million gallons of propane — usage equals gallons					
5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals % of all fuels					
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant submitting this registration maintain records to account for site-wide fuel consumption for each calendar month and each consecutive twelve (12) months, and					
are these records available for Department inspection for a period of at least five (5) years?					
[62-210.310(5)(b)4.d., F.A.C.] \square Yes \square No					
Relocation Notification - (Rule 61-210.310(5)(b)3.b., F.A.C.)					
1. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?—(if your answer is YES, please proceed to 1. a) thru 1.b) below)					
a) Did the owner or operator notify the Department by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication					
at least one (1) business day prior to changing location? Yes No					
b) Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form (DEP No. 62-210.900(6))					
to the Department no later than five (5) business days following a relocation? Yes 🔲 No					
If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below					
2. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form (DEP No. 62-210.900(6)) at					
least five (5) business days prior to relocation? Yes No					
PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)					
(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)					
1. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control					
unconfined emissions					
Which of the following methods are used:					
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?					
emissions?					
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?					

PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u>					
(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)					
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of					
particulate matter from stock piles?					
b) use of spray bar, chuie, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the arop point to the truck? 1es 1 No					
PART V: General Procedure Requirements and Conditions (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)					
Administrative 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? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] Yes No					
Permit Effective Period − [62-210.310(3)(a), F.A.C.] 1. Is the general permit for this facility still within the 5 year effective period? Yes No					
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 days prior to permit expiration?					
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership					
1. Since the last registration form submittal has there been [62-210.310 (2)(b)2]					
a) installation of any new process equipment? Ves 🔲 No					
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?					
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most					
recent notification form?					
If any of the answers to $1a - 1$ is Yes , a new registration form and appropriate fee should					
have been submitted 30 days prior to the change No					
<u>Noncompliance Notice:</u> - [62-210.310(3)(i), F.A.C.]					
1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable to comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or					
limitation of the air general permit? Yes No					
If the answer is Yes , proceed to a) and b).					
a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department?					
b) Did the notification include:					
1. A description of and cause of noncompliance? Yes 🔲 No					
2. The period of noncompliance, including dates and times; or if not corrected, the anticipated time the noncompliance is expected to					
continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance? Yes No					
PART VI: Comments					
<u>O&M Plan</u>					
The pollution control equipment shall be operated and maintained in accordance to the operation and maintenance (O&M) plan. The O&M plan shall include, but is not limited to: (1) Operating parameters of the pollution control device; (2) Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution control device as specified by the manufacturer; (3) Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control device sufficient to ensure proper operation; (4) A list of the type and quantity of the required spare parts for the pollution control device which are stored on the premises of the permit applicant; (5) A record log which will indicate, at a minimum: a. When maintenance and observations were performed; b. What maintenance and observations were performed; and c. Who performed said maintenance and observations. d. Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check.					
[Pinellas County Code, Subsection 58-128]					

Comments:

operation and the entrance was padlocked. According to M	pection was performed at the facility. The emission unit was not in Ir. Jackson the facility Representative stated the emission unit last			
been was very slow. He stated they are scheduled to perfor	s not operated since February 2012 because their concrete business has m annual visible emissions test on April 17, 2012.			
Mike Ojo Thomas	_ 3/5/12			
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\1030036 002 80769.doc				

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06