

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ⊠ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) □			
RE-INSPECTIO	ON (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
FACILITY: Vulcan Materials Company	DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name: Florida Rock Indus Plant	Southwest		
ADDRESS: 633 New Anclote Road		CONTACT PHONE:	
Tarpon Springs, FL		727-919-4392	
ARMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 11/7/2016 Renewal Date: 10/7/2016	
1030063 004	1030063-008-AG	Test Date: 3/1/2000	
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Concrete Batch Plant (Ready Mix) East silo Cement Compartment controlled by a CP-LPR-6-S-FS dust collector			
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check \(\sigma\) only one box)		
3/15/13		iance; Significant Non-Compliance	
	PART I: General Review:		
1. Permit File Review		⊠Yes ☐ No	
2. Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No	
Comments: I met with Kevin Jacob who was acting as the plant manager for that day. He answered my questions and provided maintenance documentation. Mr. Jacob also contacted the regular plant manager Ray Ford via phone to answer some other questions. 3. Is the Authorized Representative still: James Burkholder?			
PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.			
	x(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would in	ndicate 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. □ Existing Facilities — (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits) In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted on each dust collector exhaust point within 365 days (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions			
compliance test?		X Yes No	
3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit?			
4. Was the department notified at least 15 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.C.] 🖂 Yes 🔲			
5. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b)			
6. Was the facility visible emissions test(s) conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-297.401(9)(c), F.A.C] 🖂 Yes 🔲			
7. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted			

PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.			
(check \square appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance) at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,			
unless such rate is unachievable in practice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.] \boxtimes Yes \square No			
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.) \square Yes \boxtimes No			
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.] ☐ Yes ☐ No			
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.] \square Yes \square No			
Note: VE not required for truck loading w/emissions controlled by independent baghouse per DEP [04/09/2010 WRM]			
Inspector note : EU#008 (batcher controlled by separate dust collector) was test last on 2/23/11.			
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? 🗌 Yes 🔲 No			
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.			
(check \Box appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
1. Is this facility: 1) a ⊠ stationary; 2) a ☐ relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, ☐ 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.] Yes 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.]			
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) Yes No			
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			
wnconfined emissions			
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?			
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control			

PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u> (check \square appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
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?			
particulate matter from stock piles? No			
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Yes \(\Bar{\text{No}}\) No			
PART V: General Procedure Requirements and Conditions			
(check \square 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 \Big Yes \Big 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?			
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most			
recent notification form? 🗌 Yes 🛛 No			
d) Change in ownership 🗌 Yes 🗵 No			
If any of the answers to $1a$) -1) d is \underline{Yes} , a new registration form and appropriate fee should have been submitted 30 days prior to the change			
Noncompliance Notice: - [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 <u>Yes</u> , proceed to a) and b).			
a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department?			
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			
O&M Plan			
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;			
(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]			
Reviewed records for the months of12/2011-3/2013			
Comments:			

The facility yard was paved, clean, and maintained to control unconfirmonth. Some stock piles were being wet by sprinklers. All stock piles height of the break. The facility uses municipal water as its water sou	were contained in wind breaks and kept at level under the		
After a truck loaded and left, material was observed dropping out of the hopper onto the ground in the loadout area. This created some unconfined emissions for approximately one minute then it stopped. It did not appear that an opacity standard (20%) was exceeded. I inquired about this occurrence to Mr. Jacob. He checked the operation controls and could not determine why the material had dropped. Mr. Jacob stated that he would contact the maintenance crew and have them check the unit and perform any necessary maintenance or repairs.			
I reviewed the facility's "Plant Inspection and Maintenance Records" inspections were not checked off by the plant manager. The plant mar Ford explained that the monthly inspections had been performed but this procedures and frequency for performing these checks. I verbally documentation. After further review of the forms, I also found that the 2012. The last time that these checks were documented as being done signature of the person performing the inspection. A O&M Plan review	hager Mr. Ray Ford was contacted concerning this issue. Mr. hat he had forgotten to document the forms. Mr. Ford explained advised him to be sure to keep up with the maintenance e 6month and 12 month inspection had not been checked off for was in 12/2011. A few of the forms also were missing the		
No VE was performed by the inspector during inspection because no tanker earlier in the morning but no more were schedule for that day, and is usually only operating 2-3 days per week.			
Exit Interview: I informed Mr. Jacob that the facility appeared to be in manager to be sure to keep up with the maintenance inspections and defollow through on having the maintenance crew check why material verification finished loading out.	locumentation. Mr. Jacobs agreed relay this information and to		
Brennan Farrington	3/15/13		
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection		
	~ 1/2014		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		

 $H: \label{localization} II: \label{localization} WPDOCS \ Airqual \ Air_Compliance \ AQI \ 1030063\ 004\ 84755. doc$

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06