

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ⊠ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) □						
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
FACILITY: Florida Rock Industries, Inc.			DISTRICT:			
DBA/Site Name: South St. Pete. Batch Plant			Southwest			
AD	<b>DRESS:</b> 1020 31st Street South	h	CONTACT PHONE:			
St. Petersburg, FL			813-376-1158			
ARMS NO:		PERMIT NO: Expiration Date: 10/15/20				
1030085 001		1030085-005-AG	Renewal Date: 9/15/2015 Test Date:			
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Concrete Batch Plant: Truck loading and weigh hopper emissions controlled by Dust Control Systems, Inc., Model RA-1400 Central Dust Collector						
INS	PECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check \( \simeg \) only one box)				
7/	/19/11		iance; Significant Non-Compliance			
		PART I: General Review:				
1.	Permit File Review		∑Yes ☐ No			
2.	Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No			
	Comments: This is inspection was performed in order to determine if the facility has been operating within applicable regulations. Mr. Paul Bivins (manager) was present during the facility inspection of the emission unit.					
3.						
	Comments: Ms. Chumley stills the Authorized Representative.					
4.	Is the facility contact still John Berger?					
5.	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?					
2.	2. \( \subseteq \textbf{Existing Facilities} - \text{(permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits)} \) 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?\sum Yes \( \subseteq \) No					
	Test Reports  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	A.C.]			
5.	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.	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,					

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.]				
Q. Ann anning from a control bound of the character and all all and a city bound on the control of the control				
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.]				
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.]				
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?				
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.				
(check $\square$ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)  1. Is this facility: 1) a $\boxtimes$ 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 \( \sigma\) 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 $\boxtimes$ 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.]				
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.]				
<u>Relocation Notification</u> - (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?				
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?				
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?				
PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u> (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				
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?				

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, chare, or partial enclosure to miligate emissions at the arop point to the track:				
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?				
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 <b>Yes</b> , a new registration form and appropriate fee should				
have been submitted 30 days prior to the change No				
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?				
PART VI: Comments				
<ul> <li>O&amp;M Plan</li> <li>The pollution control equipment shall be operated and maintained in accordance to the operation and maintenance (O&amp;M) plan. The O&amp;M plan shall include, but is not limited to: <ol> <li>Operating parameters of the pollution control device;</li> <li>Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution control device as specified by the manufacturer;</li> <li>Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control device sufficient to ensure proper operation;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>A record log which will indicate, at a minimum: <ol> <li>When maintenance and observations were performed;</li> <li>What maintenance and observations were performed; and</li> <li>Who performed said maintenance and observations.</li> <li>Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check.</li> </ol> </li> <li>[Pinellas County Code, Subsection 58-128]</li> </ol></li></ul>				
Comments: Reviewed records for the months of 9/1/10 through 7/19/11, the records were in compliance. See attached copies of				
the operation and maintenance checklist record. The O&M Plan is been review pending approval.				

I was not able to perform a visible emissions test at the time, as no tankers were on site, and not batching at the time of inspection.

I asked Mr. Bivins to contact AQ Division office next time they plan to load silo.		
Exit Interview: During the closing conference, I told Mr. Bivins	this emission unit appears to be in compliance.	
MIL O' TI	7/10/11	
Mike Ojo Thomas	7/19/11	
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection	
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	
H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\1030085 0		

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06