

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS	1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)	
	RE-INSPECTIO	ON (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
\			DISTRICT:	
DBA/Site Name: South St. Pete. Batch Plant			Southwest	
AD	DRESS: 1020 31st Street Sout	h	CONTACT PHONE	:
	St. Petersburg, FL		813-376-1158	
AR	MS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date:	10/15/2015
	1030085 001	1030085-005-AG	Renewal Date: 9/15/2015	
	1030003 001	1000000 000 110	Test Date:	2/15/2000
	MISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Co st Control Systems, Inc., Model RA-	oncrete Batch Plant: Truck loading and weig 1400 Central Dust Collector	gh hopper emissions	controlled by
INS	SPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	eck 🗆 only one box)	
7	-30-12		iance; Significant N	Ion-Compliance
		PART I: General Review:		
1.	Permit File Review			⊠Yes □ No
2.	Introduction and Entry			⊠Yes □ No
	Comments: This is inspection was per	formed in order to determine if the facility has b	oeen onerating within a	nnlicable
		r) was present during the facility inspection of t		эрисион
3.	Is the Authorized Representative st			⊠Yes □ No
	Comments: Mr. James Lewis stills th	ne Authorized Representative.		
	The e-mail address is:	_		
4.	Is the facility contact still: John Be			⊠Yes □ No
	Comments: Mr. Berger stills the factoring The e-mail address is:	llity contact.		
5.		ne facility provide an administrative update v	vithin 30 days?	Yes No
٥.	[62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]	ie facility provide an administrative update v	vitilii 50 days.	
	DADE II. T	ECHING DECLUDENCE D. L. (2.40)	14 E A C	
		ESTING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.4 x(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would in		e)
Con	npliance Demonstration			-7
1.		uipment – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.4		
2.		pliance no later than 30 days after beginning op uant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air Gen		<u> Yes No</u>
۷.		nce, was an annual visible emissions test condu		
	collector exhaust point within 365 days	(annually thereafter) of the previous visible em	issions	
	compliance test?	Total Branch		X Yes No
3.	Do the submitted visible emission tests (Test Reports lemonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opac	rity limit?	⊠ Yes □ No
7	The last visible emission test, conducted o	on 2-15-12 resulted in an opacity of $\underline{0}\%$ for the	highest	
	ix minute average. [62-296.414(1) F.A.		G 1	
4.	Was the department notified at least 15	days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.	C.]	⊠ Yes □ No
5.		ne department as soon as practical, but no later		🛛 Yes 🔲 No
6.	Was the facility visible emissions test(s,	conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-2]	97.401(9)(c), F.A.C]	⊠ Yes □ No
7.		dust collector exhaust points was the loading o		
		rmal silo loading rate, or at least at the minimum		
	uniess such rate is unachievable in prac	tice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.]		⊠ Yes ∟ No

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)				
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	☐ Yes ☐ No		
	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.]	⊠ Yes □ No		
10	2. 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 $\underline{n/a}$ % 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: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A. (check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)	C.		
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 \square 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.]	□ v □ v.		
	1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals gallons	☐ Yes ☐ No		
	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	7		
	5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals % of all fi	ueis		
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.]	☐ Yes ☐ 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)	☐ Yes ⊠ No		
	a) Did the owner or operator notify the Department by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication	□ Vag □ Na		
	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))	∐ Yes ∐ No		
	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 \square appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
1	1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control			
		⊠ Yes ☐ No		
	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	2:		
	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 owner/operator to	⊠ Yes ∐ No		
	re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	⊠ Yes □ No		
	4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of			
	particulate matter from stock piles?	⊠ Yes □ No		

PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)			
(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	□ 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 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?				
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				
 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: Operating parameters of the pollution control device; Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution control device as specified by the manufacturer; Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control device sufficient to ensure proper operation; 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; A record log which will indicate, at a minimum: When maintenance and observations were performed; What maintenance and observations were performed; and Who performed said maintenance and observations. Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check. [Pinellas County Code, Subsection 58-128] Comments: Reviewed records for the months of 7/30/11 through 7/30/12, the records were in compliance. See attached copies of				
the operation and maintenance checklist record. 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.				

xit Interview: During the closing conference, I told	Mr. Bivins this emission unit appears to be in compliance.
Mil G. Ti	E/20/10
Mike Ojo Thomas	7/30/12
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\	

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06