

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)				
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
FACILITY: Jobsite Concrete, Inc.			DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name:			Southwest		
ADDRESS: 13650 66th Street North			CONTACT PHONE:		
Largo, FL			813-839-2748		
ARMS NO:		PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 12/13/2017		
7775153 001		7775153-004-AG	Renewal Date: 11/13/2017		
			Test Date: 2/26/2000		
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Relocatable Concrete Batch Plant: One 300 barrel cement silo, with emissions controlled by a Belgrade Steel Tank Company "Belle Style Dust House" The control device has 150 square feet on bag area, and the bags are shaken for cleaning					
INSPECTION DATE:		INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check □ only one box)			
5/29/13		☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Compliance; ☐ Significant Non-Compliance			
PART I: General Review:					
1.			⊠Yes ☐ No		
2.	. Introduction and Entry □Yes ☑ No				
<i>Comments:</i> - Conducted drive-by inspection and verified facility was shut down and not being operated at the time of inspection. EU still on-site. Gates were locked and no stockpiles present within the windbreaks. No workers were present onsite.					
3. Is the Authorized Representative still: Rick Kinsler?					
4.	Is the facility contact still: Rick Kin <i>Comments:</i> The e-mail address is: rkjobsite@ao	☐Yes ⊠ No			
5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? [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)					
 1. 2. 	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?				
Test Reports 3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit? The last visible emission test, conducted on 2/26/13 resulted in an opacity of 0.0 % 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.C.]			6 for the highest		
5.	Was the required test report filed with the	ne department as soon as practical, but no later	than 45 days after the		
6.	*	conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-2			

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)				
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.)				
PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u> (check appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)				
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 numnot associated with a change in ownership or with a physical units or operations comprising the facility; or any other simulations, did the facility provide written notification within 30 do	l relocation of the facility or any emissions ilar minor administrative change at the facility 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.	ffective period? 🖂 Yes 🔲 No			
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 3	30 days prior to permit expiration?			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership				
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replicc) replacement of existing equipment substantially differ recent notification form?	Yes			
PART VI: Comments				
Comments: During a previous conversation with Mr. Kinsler pertaining to inspection results, he indicated that his intentions were to renegotiate his purchase of equipment from Rush Concrete (Mark Roeshe) to exclude the permitted facility 7775153 (one 300 barrel cement silo).				
A letter was received via email dated 5/20/13 stating "Job Site Concrete, Inc. no longer operates or owns the silo located at 13650 66 th Street North, Largo FL 33771."				
A drive-by inspection was conducted on 5/29/13 at 13650 66 th Street North, Largo FL 33771 and from the western entrance off of Rena Dr. The gate was locked and no workers were present on site. The silo was still located at the property. There was a minute amount of sand and aggregate located in the wind break storage area on site.				
GP Facility permanent shutdown process will be completed including ARMS update.				
Previously, the silo was not used on a frequent basis and the facility would often appear to not to be in use.				
Brennan Farrington Inspector's Name	5/29/13 Data of Inspection			
Inspector's Name Date of Inspection				
	~1/2014			

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

Inspector's Signature