

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

IN	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)		AINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)		
ΑI	IRS ID#: 0850138 DA	TE: <u>2/22/2012</u>	ARRIVE	9:45	DEPART: <u>12:3</u>	<u>0</u>	
FA	ACILITY NAME: US	PAVERSCAPE					
FA	ACILITY LOCATION	1735 SE FEDERAL	L HWY				
		STUART 34994					
CO	WNER/AUTHORIZE Email: ONTACT NAME: Email: NTITLEMENT PERIO	D REPRESENTATIVE: OD: 7/27/2008 / 7/27/	2013	ULDING PHONE: Mobile: PHONE: Mobile:	(772)223-7287 (772)201-9262		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE							
	Name(s) of facility rep Brief Notes:	resentative(s):	<u>G</u>				only one question)
2.	Is the Authorized Reprise If no, who is?:	resentative still RAYMONI	O PAULDING?		🖂	Yes	□No
3.	If different, did the factor Is the facility contact so If no, who is?:	cility provide an administrat till ?	ive update within	30 days?		Yes Yes	□No □No
4.		eting VE test(s) during toda ance authority notified at lea				Yes Yes	□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-cement (gray) silo #1, w/pulse cartridge filter subject to Reasonable Precautions

PA	ART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹 box for each	
	Date of last inspection: 4/16/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? C. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	No No No
PA	ART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(ahaalt 🔽	only one
Uı	nconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Onveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check b ox for each	only one question)
1.	Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfigures emissions by:	ned	
	 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?	X Yes	□ No □ No
	owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?	_	□ No□ No
	b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	Yes	⊠ No
2.	If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 2 –CCB Plant-cement (white) silo #1, w/pulse cartridge filter subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check box for each	only one ch question)
Date of last inspection: 4/16/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	/ 1 1 5	7 1
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u>	<u>d</u>	only one ch question)
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles		
 Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions emissions by: 	to control unconfined	
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals w 	X Yes	☐ No
control emissions?	Yes	⊠ No
owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce a particulate matter?	airborne Yes	☐ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wi particulate matter from stock piles?		☐ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop po	int to the truck? Yes	⊠ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 3 –CCB Plant-cement (gray) silo #2, w/pulse cartridge filter subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check v box for each of	
Date of last inspection: 4/16/2010 Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? C. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	🔲 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfinemissions by:	ned	
 a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? 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? reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles? 	-	□ No□ No□ No□ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	- Yes	☐ No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes Yes	☐ No ☐ No

Emissions Unit Section 4 –CCB Plant-cement (white) silo #2, w/pulse cartridge filter subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check ☑ only one box for each question)
Date of last inspection: Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? - If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C. Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storag Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock	
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precau emissions by:	ntions to control unconfined
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall ince 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yard 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemic control emissions? 3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under owner/operator to re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to receparticulate matter? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate particulate matter from stock piles?	Is? Yes No cals when necessary to Yes No control of the duce airborne Yes No net wind entrainment of
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the dro	op point to the truck? Yes No
2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?	Yes No No

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C</u> (ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit: a. 10 tons per year or more of any hazardous air pollutant? b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? c 100 tons per year or more of any other regulated air pollutant?		Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No
2.	Does this facility include: a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception of units and activities that are exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection Rule 62-210.300(3) or Rule 62-4.040, F.A.C.)? If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		Yes	⊠ No
	b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air general permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility?		Yes	⊠ No
3.	Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to: a. 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel? b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	\boxtimes	Yes Yes Yes	 No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propare 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane.		<u> < 1.00</u> ?	?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consump for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?	tion	Yes	⊠ No
_		<u> </u>		
<u>G</u>	ENERAL CONDITIONS			
1.	Has the owner or operator allowed the circumvention of any air pollution control device, or allowed the emission of air pollutants without the proper operation of all applicable air pollution control			
	devices?	- 🔲	Yes	⊠ No
2.	Does the owner or operator: a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?		Yes	☐ No
	b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all terms and conditions of the air general permit?	\square	Ves	☐ No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, access to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general			
	permit and Department rules?	\bowtie	Yes	☐ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		neck 🗹 only one
1. Is the facility: stationary ⊠; relocatable □; or consisting of both state concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If a</i>)	tionary and relocatable	for each question) stion 2.)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)	_	Yes No
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Loe- e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prob. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificat 	ior to changing location?	Yes No
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notificati	s days following a relocation? on Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)]	Yes No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five b 3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air		Yes No
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose?	that separate permit:	Yes No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it w co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		Yes
CHANGES		. 🗖 .
		neck 🗹 only one for each question)
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of	e facility or authorized representative n	• ,
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini		
	strative change at the facility?	Yes No No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been	strative change at the facility? the change?	Yes No No
 If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	the change?	Yes 🗵 No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	the change?	Yes No No No Yes No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substant	the change?	Yes No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substar d. A change in ownership?	the change?	Yes No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment? b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substar d. A change in ownership?	the change?	Yes No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	the change?	Yes No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership: 3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been a. Installation of any new process equipment?	the change? the change? the change? the change?	Yes No

COMMENTS: An inspection and VE test observation was conducted on February 22, 2012 at US Paverscape . US Paverscape is a manufacture of stone for landscaping and patios. Trucks from outside suppliers transport raw material into bins and silos. This activity could cause fugitive emissions if the trucks are ill maintained. During the testing the facility representatives alerted the truckers to this possibility. No fugitive emissions from the trucks were observed. Paverscape does not have a truck fueling station on site thus no records for fuel were available. The facility did not conduct a VE test in 2011.

VE testing was conducted by Bill Arlington of Arlington Environmental Services. Only 3 fo 4 silo's were tested. During the testing, emissions were observed briefly from the North silo containing white cement. However, the unit was shut down for

maintenance before data culd b recorded. The seal on the cap of the silo was replaced and no further emissions were observed. The facility grounds were well maintained.