

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
FACILITY: Hetro Corporation		DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name: Hetro Corporation -		Southwest		
ADDRESS: 1455 North McMuller	n Booth Road	CONTACT PHONE:		
Clearwater, FL		727-725-3233		
ARMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 3/9/11 Renewal Date: 2/7/11		
1030124 001	1030124-003-AG	Test Date: 2/7/00		
<i>EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Concrete Batch Plant (U-Cart Plant))with 200 barrel cement storage silo, controlled by a Belgrade Steel Company, Model BST-100 Baghouse, mounted at ground level. Emissions from the batching operation are vented back to the silo.				
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (cl	neck only one box)		
04/16/09	🛛 In Compliance; 🔲 Minor Non-Comp	iance; 🔲 Significant Non-Compliance		
	PART I: General Review:			
1. Permit File Review		Yes No		
2. Introduction and Entry		Yes No		
Comments : The facility appears to be out of business as the aggregate bins and silo have been removed. There are electrical wires protruding from the ground where the silo was located (picture attached). The property is disused and the telephone is not answered.				
3. <i>Is the Authorized Representative stil</i> <i>Comments:</i>				
4. <i>Is</i> the facility contact still <u>David Schaffer</u> ? <i>Comments:</i>				
5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Yes No [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] Yes Yes Yes				
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. 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 tested within 365 days (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions compliance test? Yes No 				
Test Reports 3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit? Yes No The last visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six minute average. [62-296.414(1) F.A.C.]				
4. Was the department notified at least 15	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 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 🗌 No				
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 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.]	Yes 🗌 No	
	 Are emissions from the 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.] If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from 	Yes No	
	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.]	g Yes 🗌 No	
	 Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according?		
	PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.4	A.C.	
	(check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	e)	
1.	Is this facility: 1) a \square stationary; 2) a \square relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, \square stationary and relocatal concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check only one box.)	ole	
2.	For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concreted batch 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.] 1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals 2) 23,000 gallons of gasoline – usage equals 3) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas – usage equals 4) 1.3 million gallons of propane – usage equals 5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals % of all	Yes No	
3.	<i>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant submitting this registration</i> maintain records to account for site-wide fuel consumption for each calendar month and each consecutive twelve (12) months, and <i>are</i> 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	
1.	 <u>Relocation Notification</u> - (Rule 61-210.310(5)(b)3.b., F.A.C.) 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	
2.	<i>If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below</i> 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 noncompliance)			
1.	Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions	Yes No	
	 a) manuagement of rotats, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one of more of more	Yes No	

3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to

PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)			
(check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
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 b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Yes No			
PART V: <u>General Procedure Requirements and Conditions</u>			
(check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance) Administrative Changes:			
 Were there any change 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 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 Yes			
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 prior to permit expiration? Yes No			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership			
 Since the last registration form submittal has there been [62-210.310 (2)(b)2] a) installation of any new process equipment? b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form? d) Change in ownership f) d is <u>Yes</u> to any, 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 comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation of the air general permit? 1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation of the air general permit? 1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation of the air general permit?			
PART VI: <u>Comments</u>			

<u>O&M Plan</u>			
 The pollution control equipment shall be operated and maintained in ac 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 of (3) Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control (4) A list of the type and quantity of the required spare parts for 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 c. Who performed said maintenance and observations. Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check. 	device as specified by the manufacturer; ntrol device sufficient to ensure proper operation; pollution control device which are stored on the premises of the d		
Reviewed records for the months ofN/A			
Comments: The facility appears to be out of business as the aggregate bins and silo have been removed. There are electrical wires protruding from the ground where the silo was located (picture attached). The property is disused and the telephone is not answered.			
Exit Interview: N/A			
Chris Brodeur	04/16/09		
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection		
	N/A		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection		

 $H: \label{eq:last_eq_last_eq$