

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) 🗵 COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) 📋						
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:						
FACILITY: All American Concrete, Inc.			DISTRICT:			
DB.	A/Site Name: Largo Plant	Southwest				
AD	<b>DRESS:</b> 8770 Somerset Drive	CONTACT PHONE:				
Largo, FL			727-524-8755			
AR	MS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 5/8/2015			
	1020464 001		<b>Renewal Date:</b> 4/8/2015			
1030464 001		1030464-004-AG	<b>Test Date:</b> 4/2/2000			
<i>EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Portable Concrete Batching: Belgrade Steel & Manufacturing, Inc. 300 Barrel storage bin controlled by Belgrade Steel & Manufacturing, Inc., Model BST 150 Baghouse. Meter-Mix trucks are loaded by a sealed auger/hose; emissions are vented back to the bin						
INS	PECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check □ only one box)				
10	0/25/10		liance; Significant Non-Compliance			
		PART I: General Review:				
1.	Permit File Review		⊠Yes □ No			
2.	Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No			
Comments: This inspection was performed in order to determine if this facility has been operating within applicable regulations. Mr. James King (Supervisor) was present during the facility inspection of the emission unit.						
3.	3. Is the Authorized Representative still Jeffery J. Nasse?					
	Comments: Jeffery Nasse stills the Authorized Representative.					
4.	25 the family contact Still <u>602227, 67 1 table</u>					
	Comments: Jeffery Nasse stills the fac	·				
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         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. \( \sum \) 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? \( \sum \) Yes \( \sum \) No						
Test Reports  3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit?						
4.	4. Was the department notified at least 15 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.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  \Bigsim 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,					

DADE II. TECTING DECLIDEMENTS. DL. (2.20/.414 E.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)					
unless such rate is unachievable in practice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.]	⊠ Yes				
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.]					
	res   100				
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.] 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 batcher					
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? Yes 🛛 No					
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?	Yes No				
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-210.310(5)(b)					
(check $\square$ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompli	ance)				
1. Is this facility: 1) a ⊠ stationary; 2) a ☐ relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, ☐ stationary and relocatable	catable				
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check $\square$ only one box.)					
	. 1 . 1 .				
2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concrete ba	tening 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.]					
1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals gallons					
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	C 11 C 1				
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.]	☐ 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	□ V □ N				
stabilization?—( <b>if your answer is YES, please proceed to 1. a</b> ) <b>thru 1.b</b> ) <b>below</b> )	res 🖂 No				
a) Did the owner or operator hotty the Department by telephone, e-mail, jax, or written communication at least one (1) business day prior to changing location?	□ Vag □ Na				
	Yes   No				
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?	Yes				
to the Department no taler than five (5) business adys following a relocation?	res   Ivo				
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 noncompli	ance)				
1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control					
unconfined emissions					
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:					
1) Paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	Yes \( \) No				
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: <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, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Yes \(\Bar{\Bar}\) No				
o) use of spray car, chance, or partial encressure to minigate chansions at the area point to the track.				
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				
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? Yes 🔯 No				
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? Yes 🗵 No				
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?				
d) Change in ownership Yes X No				
If any of the answers to $1a - 1$ is <u>Yes</u> , 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? Yes 🗵 No				
If the answer is <u>Yes</u> , proceed to a) and b).  a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department?				
b) Did the notification include:				
1. A description of and cause of noncompliance? Yes No				
2. The period of noncompliance, including dates and times; or if not corrected, the anticipated time the noncompliance is expected to				
continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance? Yes No				
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:				
(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 1/2/09 through 10/21/10, indicated emission unit in compliance.				
Mr. King stated business has been very slow. He stated the silo has been pneumatic loaded once a month. At the time.				

I was not able to perform a visible emissions test at the time, as no tanker was onsite. Mr. King stated they would not be

receiving any more pneumatic loading for the silo today. I as	sked Mr. King to contact AQ Division office next time they
plan to load silo.	
Exit Interview: During the closing conference, I told Mr.	king this emission unit appears to be in compliance.
Mike Ojo Thomas	10/25/10
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection
	- A D A CN AT A
Inspector's Signature H:\users\wpdocs\airqual\Air_Compliance\AQI\103	Approximate Date of Next Inspection 0464 001 75663.doc

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06