

**CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT** 



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY	Y (CI)	
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 7775209 DA	ATE: <u>4/6/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>12:08 PM</u>	DEPART: <u>12:20 PM</u>	
FACILITY NAME: HA	AYWARD BAKER-BENJAMIN I	RD-CCB PLANT		
FACILITY LOCATION	N: 6850 Benjamin Road			
	TAMPA 33634			
OWNER/AUTHORIZE Email: CONTACT NAME:	E <b>D REPRESENTATIVE:</b> DEAL	AN ELLIOT PHONE: Mobile: PHONE:	(813)884-3441	
Email:		Mobile:		
ENTITLEMENT PERI	IOD: 7/14/2008 / 7/14/2013 (effective date) (end date)			
Facility Section				
PART I. INSPECTION	N COMPLIANCE STATUS (che	peck 🗹 only one box)		

TARTI, <u>INSECTION CON</u>	<u>MILIANCE STATUS</u> (CHECK EL OIII	ly one box)
IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE	SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

PA	ART II: <u>ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING</u>	(check 🗹	only one
1.	Name(s) of facility representative(s):	box for each	question)
	Brief Notes:		
2.	Is the Authorized Representative still DEAN ELLIOT?	Yes	No
3.	If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Is the facility contact still ? If no, who is?:	Yes Yes	□No □No
4.	Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection?		□No □No

## **Emissions Unit Section** <u>Subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

	(check 🗹	only one
	box for each	•
1. Date of last inspection: $\frac{7/13/2010}{2}$	001 101 0401	question
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	<b>—</b>	<u> </u>
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?		
b. Has a VE test been performed yet within the current calendar year?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		
d. Date of last VE test:	Yes	∐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test?	🗌 Yes	□ No
f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?		
g. What was the actual silo loading rate? tons/hour		
h. If weigh hopper(batcher) emissions controlled by the silo dust collector, did the report state		
whether or not batching occurred during emissions testing? N/A	Yes	🗌 No
i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test?	🗌 Yes	∐ No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other	( 1 1- <b></b>	1
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹	only one
chelosed storage and conveying equipment	box for each	question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?	Yes	□ No
b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average.		
c. Did the visible emission test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
If not, what was the problem (if known)?		_
-		
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not lo	aded during ins	spection.
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not lo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	aded during ins	
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	aded during ins	spection.
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not lo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice? f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	aded during ins 	spection.
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? $\Box$ Yes $\Box$ No $\Box$ N/A – silo not lo e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?	aded during ins 	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? □ Yes □ No □ N/A - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant            Yes            Yes           to h.            Yes	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? □ Yes □ No □ N/A - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant            Yes            Yes           to h.         Yes            Yes           rate and         Yes	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? □ Yes □ No □ N/A - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant      Yes     to h.   Yes      Yes     rate and      Yes	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? □ Yes □ No □ N/A - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant          Yes         to h.          Yes         rate and          Yes         nutes       Yes	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during ins Yes to h. Yes rate and Yes nutes ich is separate billector	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during ins Yes to h. Yes rate and Yes nutes ich is separate ollector n?  Yes	spection.
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during ins Yes to h. Yes rate and Yes nutes ich is separate ollector n?  Yes utes.	spection. No No No No
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during ins Yes to h. Yes rate and Yes rate and Yes nutes ich is separate ollector on?  Yes utes. Yes	spection. No No No No No No
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during ins Yes to h. Yes rate and Yes rate and Yes nutes ich is separate ollector on?  Yes utes. Yes	spection. No No No No
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant          Yes         to h.       Yes          Yes         rate and       Yes          Yes         ich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Yes         utes.       Yes          Yes         Utes.       Yes          Yes         Yes       Yes	spection. No No No No No No No
<ul> <li>that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No NA - silo not lot e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?</li></ul>	aded during instant          Yes         to h.       Yes          Yes         rate and       Yes          Yes         ich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Separate         Sich is separate       Yes         utes.       Yes          Yes         Utes.       Yes          Yes         Yes       Yes	spection. No No No No No No

## **Emissions Unit Section** <u>Subject to Reasonable Precautions</u>

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
<ol> <li>Date of last inspection: <u>7/13/2010</u></li> <li>Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity? N/A</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ol>	🗌 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(ah a ala 🔽	
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and</u> Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards	(check ☑ box for each	only one question)
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfi emissions by:</li> </ol>	ined	
<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to</li> </ul>		🗌 No
<ul><li>control emissions?</li></ul>	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
particulate matter? 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?		□ No □ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No
<ul> <li>2. If reasonable precautions <u>not</u> being taken:</li> <li>a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)?</li> <li>b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions &lt; 20% opacity?</li> <li>c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?</li> </ul>	🗌 Yes 🗌 Yes	☐ No ☐ No

## **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C</u> (	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(check 🗹 onl	u one how
		for each qu	
		ior caen qu	estion)
1.	Does this facility keep records to show that it does not have the potential to emit:	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>
	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	∐ No
2	Does this facility include:		
	a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception	n 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.)?	🗌 Yes	□ No
	If YES, what non-exempt units or activities?		
	·		
	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
	If YES, what other general permit units or activities?		
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?	🗌 Yes	No No
	b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline?		No
	c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas?	TYes	No
	d. 1.3 million gallons of propane?	🗌 Yes	No No
	e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
	$\underline{\text{gal diesel/yr}} + \underline{\text{gal gasoline/yr}} + \underline{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \underline{\text{MM gal prop}}$		?
	275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propa	ne/yr	
4	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consur	motion	
т.	for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		□ No
1	period for the passe female.		

G	ENERAL CONDITIONS	(check ☑ on for each qu	
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		
2	devices? Does the owner or operator:	🗋 Yes	∐ No
2.	<ul><li>a. Maintain the authorized facility in good condition?</li><li>b. Ensure that the facility maintains its eligibility to use the air general permit and complies with all</li></ul>	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
	terms and conditions of the air general permit?		🗌 No
3.	Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general permit and Department rules?		🗌 No

<ol> <li>Is the facility: stationary : relocatable ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (<i>If only stationary, skip the followin</i></li> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?</li></ol>	·	No
<ul> <li>(If YES, answer 2. a and 2 .b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.)</li> <li>a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location?</li></ul>	6)] - 🗌 Yes )]	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation per and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit:</li> <li>a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage If YES, what was the purpose?</li> <li>b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it was co-located at the permitted facility?</li></ul>	e)? 🗌 Yes	□ No □ No □ No
<ul> <li><u>CHANGES</u></li> <li><u>Administrative Changes</u>:</li> <li>Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representa associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions un operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?</li> </ul>	its or	•

Ζ.	If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	res	
Ne	ew 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?	Yes	No
	b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	No
	c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?	Yes	No No
	d. A change in ownership?	Yes	No No
4.	If the answer to any question 3a d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitt	ted	
	30 days prior to the change? [	Yes	No No

FRANK DELGADO

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

4/6/2011

**COMMENTS:** THE PORTABLE CONCRETE BATCH PLANT HAS BEEN RELOCATED TO TAMPA, FLORIDA. I SPOKE BY PHONE TO TOM SHASKE, HAYWARD BAKER, INC.'S SUPERINTENDENT, HE TOLD ME THAT THE PLANT WAS RELOCATED TO TAMPA, FLORIDA SEVERAL MONTHS AGO.