

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

| ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) | COMPLAINT/DISCOVE | ERY (CI) 🔀 | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| RE-INSPECTION (FUI) | ARMS COMPLAINT NO | D: | | |
| TE: <u>5/11/07</u> | ARRIVE: <u>7:15am</u> | DEPART: <u>8:45am</u> | | |
| NSACOLA FACILITY | | | | |
| V: 8653 Pensacola Blvd | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | E: (850)475-4105 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ENTIT | | | | |
| | | | | |
| COMPLIANCE STATUS (C | check 🗹 only one box) | | | |
| ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) | | | | |
| m silos, weigh hoppers (batche extent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust col | rs), and other enclosed storage a emissions to 5 percent opacity? Elector exhaust points was the lo | and conveying equipment | | |
| | RE-INSPECTION (FUI) TE: 5/11/07 NSACOLA FACILITY N: 8653 Pensacola Blvd PENSACOLA 32534 TAL: R KENT Andrew Kent ENTITY COMPLIANCE STATUS (COMPLIANCE STATUS) ECORDKEEPING REQUIRE The box(es)) Sions tests conducted during the extent necessary to limit visible dissions tests of the silo dust column to the silo dust column. | RE-INSPECTION (FUI) | | |

| PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued) (check ☑ appropriate box(es) | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.) 1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.) | Yes No |
| b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form |]Yes |
| Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? | ∐Yes □ No |
| Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.) 4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed? | ∐Yes □ No |
| _ | |
| · | |
| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) | |
| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. | |
| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 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? (<i>Please check ☒ only one box.</i>) 2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i> , then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)———————————————————————————————————— | Yes ⊠ No Yes □ No Yes □ No |

| PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued) (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| Unconfined Emissions — (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.) 1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by: 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? | | | | |
| DADTIV. SDECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES | Pulo 62 210 300(4)(d)4 F A C | | | |
| PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C. A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u> | | | | |
| 1. Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any new process equipment? | | | | |
| local program office? | | □Yes □ No | | |
| Greg Landry | 5/11/07 | | | |
| Inspector's Name (Please Print) | Date of Inspection | _ | | |
| /s/ | 5/15/08 | | | |
| Inspector's Signature | Approximate Date of Next Inspection | _ | | |

COMMENTS: The Department received dust complaints on this facility on 5/9/07 & 5/10/07. Mr. Kent indicated a truck overloaded the silo on 5/9 which caused heavy dusting when the material began to blow out the top of the silo. They do not know what may have caused dusting on 5/10. No other trucks have unloaded into the silo since the overload on 5/9 and they aren't due for another truck until 5/14. I suggested they inspect the baghouse for possible bag damage or gasket problems before the next truck arrives. Mr. Kent indicated this would be taken care of.

An additional field inspection was conducted on 5/11/07 when I noticed the baghouse dusting. A six minute visible emissions test was conducted and averaged approximately 50% opacity versus a permit limit of 5% opacity on the baghouse. Mr. Pino indicated via telephone that when he got out the message and went out to the silo the truck had finished loading. On 5/14/07 Mr. Pino indicated they would not receive any more trucks until the problem was corrected and would use the Milton location until that was accomplished. On 5/17/07 Mr. Pino indicated that new bags would be installed that day. The new bags were not installed until 5/22/07 and the facility continued to receive trucks in the interim.

Since the annual VE test is due in June, I suggested they go ahead and schedule the test as soon as possible and turn in the 15 day notification.

Note: This facility is not a normal batching operating. They bring in dry concrete via truck and unload into the silo. The facility trucks then load dry cement in one tank on the truck and water and catalyst into a separate tank. The cement and water are then mixed for use at the job site.