

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| IN | SPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS | 1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVER | Y (CI) | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------|--|
| | RE-INSPECTIO | ON (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO: | | | |
| FA | | rmwater, Pavement and Traffic Operations | DISTRICT: | | |
| DBA/Site Name: Cement Storage Silo | | | Southwest | | |
| | DRESS: 1635 3rd Avenue Nor | CONTACT PHON | E: | | |
| | St. Petersburg, FL | | 727-892-5662 | | |
| AR | MS NO: | PERMIT NO: | Expiration Date: | 7/13/2013 | |
| | 1030107 001 | 1030107-003-AG | Renewal Date: 6/ | 13/2013 | |
| | 1030107 001 | 1030107-003-AG | Test Date: | 3/18/2000 | |
| | MISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Cograde Steel baghouse | oncrete Batch Plant: 1 Belgrade Steel 270 B | BL cement silo cont | rolled by a | |
| INS | PECTION DATE: | INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch | neck only one box) | | |
| | /27/2010 | ☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Compl | • | Non-Compliance | |
| | | PART I: General Review: | | | |
| 1. | Permit File Review | TAKTI. General Review. | | ⊠Yes □ No | |
| 2. | Introduction and Entry | | | ⊠Yes □ No | |
| | | | | | |
| | | rmed in order to determine if this facility has l ty worker) was present during the facility inspe | | | |
| | regulations. Ms. Jossie Espinosa (Cu | y worker) was present auring the Jacuity inspe | ction of the emission | unu. | |
| 3. | <i>I</i> s the Authorized Representative sti | ll Carl J. Blahut? | | ⊠Yes □ No | |
| | Comments: Mr. Blahut stills the Auth | | | | |
| 4. | Is the facility contact still Jossie Esp | oinosa? | | ⊠Yes □ No | |
| | Comments: Ms. Espinosa stills the fac | cility contact. | | | |
| 5. | If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did to [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] | he facility provide an administrative update | within 30 days? | Yes No | |
| | PART II: 7 | TESTING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296. | 414. F.A.C. | | |
| | (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance) | | | | |
| <u>Co</u> 1. | mpliance <u>Demonstration</u> New Facilities / New Process E | Equipment — (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296, appliance no later than 30 days after beginning o | 414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air | General Permits) | |
| 2. | In order to demonstrate annual complication collector exhaust point within 365 day | rsuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air Ge ance, was an annual visible emissions test cond as (annually thereafter) of the previous visible en | lucted on each dust missions | ⊠ Yes □ No | |
| 3. | | demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent open an opacity of $_0$ % for the highest six minute a | | ⊠ Yes □ No | |
| 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 | r than 45 days after th | ee | |
| 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. | | o dust collector exhaust points was the loading or rmal silo loading rate, or at least at the minimu | | e, | |

| 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 noncompliant to the complex of the co | ance) |
|---|--------------|
| unless such rate is unachievable in practice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.] | |
| | Z 100 _ 110 |
| 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 the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector while batc at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [62-296.414(3)(d), F.A.C.] | hing |
| 10. Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity ofn/a% 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), (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliant control of the control of | |
| 1. Is this facility: 1) a \boxtimes stationary; 2) a \square relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, \square stationary and reloc | |
| concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check only one box.) | |
| 2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concrete bat 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.]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.] | 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 5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals % of | 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.] | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| <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 | Yes No |
| 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 |
| 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: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u> (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliant to the shaded box is checked. | ance) |
| 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 foll 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/operato re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? | |

| PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| (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, 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 appropriate boy(cs) if a sheded boy is checked, this would indicate percompliance) | | | | | |
| (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? \boxtimes Yes \square No | | | | | |
| 2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 days prior to permit expiration? 🗌 Yes 🔲 No | | | | | |
| 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? | | | | | |
| 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: | | | | | |

- 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: Reviewed records for the months of 1/1/09 through 7/27/10, 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 Ms. Espinosa to contact AQ Division office next time they plan to load silo.

| xit Interview: During the closing conference, I told M | <i>Is. Espinosa this emission unit appears to be in compliance.</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Mike Ojo Thomas | 7-27-10 |
| Inspector's Name | Date of Inspection |
| | |
| Turam a da mão Câmo da mo | Annuarius de Dete ef Neut Inquestion |
| Inspector's Signature H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\1 | Approximate Date of Next Inspection |

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06