

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
FACILITY: Home Building Materials, Inc. DIS		DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name: Carroll's Building Materials		Southwest		
ADDRESS: 2001 13th Avenue North		CONTACT PHONE:		
St. Petersburg, FL		727-822-3370		
ARMS NO: PERMIT NO:		Expiration Date: 2/3/2015		
1030280 001	1030280-006-AG	Renewal Date: 1/4/2015		
1050200 001		Test Date: 12/2/2000		
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Cement Silo controlled by a Stephens Model SV-170 Baghouse				
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check 🗆 only one box)		
1/24/2012	In Compliance; Minor Non-Com	pliance; 🗌 Significant Non-Compliance		
	PART I: General Review:			
1. Permit File Review		¥es No		
2. Introduction and Entry		Yes No		
Comments : This inspection was performed in order to determine if facility has been operating within applicable regulations. Mr. Kennedy (manager) was present during the facility inspection of the emission units.				
3. <i>Is</i> the Authorized Representative sti		$\square Yes \square No$		
Comments: Mark Carroll still the Authorized Representative.				
4. <i>Is</i> the facility contact still <u>Mark Ca</u>	rroll?	Yes No		
Comments: Mark Carroll still the facility contact.				
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.]				
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				
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. X 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 				
1				
Test Reports 3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit?				
4. Was the department notified at least 1.	5 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F	T.A.C.] Xes 🗌 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] X 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.]			
 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.)			
 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 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. 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: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.			
(check [] 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 🗆 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.]			
b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to the fuel usages	Yes No		
1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel –usage equals gallons2) 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 equalsgallons 5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals% of all fuels 	els		
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)	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		
<i>If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below</i> 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: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u>			
(check			
Which of the following methods are used:	Yes 🗌 No		
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?	Yes 🗌 No		
	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?	Yes 🗌 No		

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?			
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: 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			
<u>Permit Effective Period</u> – [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? 🗌 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? b) alterations to existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?			
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: <u>Comments</u>			

<u>O&M Plan</u>

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;
- (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]

Comments: Reviewed records for the months of 3/1/11 to 1/24/12 indicated emission unit in compliance.

I was not able to perform visible emission test, because no pneumatic loading of the silo at the time. I told Mr. Kennedy to let me

known when they plan to pneumatic loading the silo.

Exit Interview: I informed Mr. Kennedy, that it appears the fact	ility is in compliance.
Mike Ojo Thomas	1-24-2012
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection

 Inspector's Signature
 Approximate Date of Next Inspection

 H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\1030280 001 80731.doc