

### **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



#### COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: AN	NNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/D ARMS COMPLA		Y (CI)	
AIRS ID#: 1150141 DATE:	1/7/2013	ARRIVE: <u>12:15</u>		DEPART: <u>1:30</u>	
FACILITY NAME: ALL A	MERICAN READY MIX (	CONCRETE			
FACILITY LOCATION:	4824 Ashton Rd				
	SARASOTA 34233-3	3409			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED R Email: CONTACT NAME: JOHN Email: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:	I TZANNETAKIS	HN TZANNETAKIS	Mobile:	(941)923-4400 (941)923-4400	
Facility Section  PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box)  ☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☑ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE					
PART II: ONSITE INTROI  1. Name(s) of facility represe  Brief Notes:					only one each question)
2. Is the Authorized Represer If no, who is?:	ntative still JOHN TZANNI	ETAKIS?		X Yes	s 🔲No
If different, did the facility 3. Is the facility contact still ( If no, who is?: JOHN TZ.					
4. Will facility be conducting If yes, was the compliance	VE test(s) during today's i authority notified at least 1				

# Emissions Unit Section 1 –cement storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 12/15/2009 2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:	(check <b>✓</b> only one box for each question)
a. Was a VE test performed within each of the past 4 calendar years?	
operation? N/A  d. Date of last VE test: 12/30/2011	☐ Yes ☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing?g. What was the actual silo loading rate? ~25 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  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE If not, what was the problem (if known)?	test? X Yes No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 only one
enciosed 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?	
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	Yes No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X Yes No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? ∑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A − silo i	
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?f. What was the silo loading rate? > 25 tons/hour	
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collecto <i>If YES</i> , then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ ) below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ ) and	
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batch duration?	Yes No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collecto	or which is separate
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) do conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and du 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration?	uration?  Yes  No
<ol> <li>Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?</li> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ol>	
<ul> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? &gt; 25 tons/hour.</li> </ul>	

## Emissions Unit Section 2 –sand/stone storage area; yard area subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check <b>☑</b> box for each	
Date of last inspection: 12/15/2009     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)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check 🗹	only one
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	box for each	question)
Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards		
<ol> <li>Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconf emissions by:</li> </ol>	ined	
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
application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?	X Yes	☐ No
3) 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?	🕅 Yes	□ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	_	
particulate matter from stock piles?	X Yes	☐ 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:		
<ul><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></ul>		∐ No □ No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		

# Emissions Unit Section 3 –loading of volumetric mixer trucks subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each o	only one question)
Date of last inspection: 12/15/2009     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? N/A  c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)?		☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
DADT H. FIELD OBSERVATIONS   Dule (2.20(.414/2)) E A.C.		
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.	(check <b>✓</b> box for each of	only one question)
<u>Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards</u>		1
Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconcemissions by:	fined	
<ul> <li>a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of th</li> <li>1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?</li> </ul>		□ No
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions?	\( \sum \text{ Yes}	☐ No
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?		☐ No
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of particulate matter from stock piles?		☐ No
b. Use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? -		☐ 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 –flyash storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION  1. Date of last inspection: 12/15/2009	(check 🗹 of for each of	
2. Past Visible Emissions (VE) tests:  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?  c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing		□ No ☑ No
operation?	Yes Yes	☐ No
e. Was the VE test report filed with the compliance authority no later than 45 days after the test? f. Did the report state the actual silo loading rate during emissions testing? g. What was the actual silo loading rate? ~25 tons/hour		☐ No ☐ No
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  i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing? j. What was the actual batching rate? tons/hour	Yes Yes	□ No 図 No
k. Did the emissions unit demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit during the last VE test.  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	? X Yes	☐ No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check 🗹 o	only one box question)
1. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the facility for this unit during this site visit?	× Yes	☐ No
<ul> <li>a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?</li> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average.</li> </ul>	X Yes	☐ No
c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?  If not, what was the problem (if known)?	X Yes	☐ No
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? Yes No N/A – silo not l		
e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?  f. What was the silo loading rate? ~25 tons/hour		☐ No
g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?  If YES, then continue on to questions $g.1) - g.3$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g.1) - g.3$ and go		⊠ No
1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?	Yes	☐ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching duration?	Yes	☐ No
3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? m  h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector where the state of the state	nich is separate	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and durati 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? min	on? Yes	⊠ No
2. Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit? a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9?		⊠ No □ No
<ul> <li>b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of % for the highest six-minute average.</li> <li>c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?</li> <li>d. What was the process rate? tons/hour.</li> </ul>	Yes	□ No

### **Facility Section (continued)**

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			ļ
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
2.	Does this facility include:  a. Any emission units or activities not covered by the applicable air general permit (with the exception o 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
	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)?		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No No
	gal diesel/yr + gal gasoline/yr + MM SCF nat. gas/yr + MM gal propane/ 275,000 gal diesel/yr 23,000 gal gasoline/yr 44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr 1.3 MM gal propane/	<u>ie/yr</u> /yr	<u> </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
_				
Gl	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			K-71 3.7
2.	devices?  Does the owner or operator:	Ш	Yes	⊠ No
	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?	$\boxtimes$	Yes	☐ 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:		(check <b>☑</b>	only one
<ol> <li>Is the facility: stationary ∑; relocatable ☐; or consisting of both state</li> </ol>	ationary and relocatable	box for each	•
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? ( <i>If</i>		g question 2.	)
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		_	
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?		· Yes	☐ No
(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c below.) a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department or Lo	ocal Air Program by telephone		
e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day p		☐ Yes	☐ No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notifica	tion Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	5)]	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five busines			☐ No
<ul> <li>c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five be</li> </ul>			□ No
to the appropriate Department of Local All Program at least five t	districts days prior to relocation:	<u> </u> 103	110
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air		nit,	
and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in		v2 □ <b>V</b> 25	□ No
a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpo If YES, what was the purpose?	ose (i.e., there is no repeated usage)	i les	□ No
b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how long it v			
co-located at the permitted facility?		- Yes	□ No
If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration?		- L Yes	∐ No
CHANCES			
<u>CHANGES</u>		(check ☑	
Administrative Changes:		box for each	question)
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			⊠ N.
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor admini 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days o			⊠ No □ No
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership:	the change.		
3. Since the last registration form submittal has there been		_	
a. Installation of any new process equipment?			⊠ No
<ul><li>b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? -</li><li>c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substa</li></ul>			⊠ No ⊠ No
d. A change in ownership?		· Tes	⊠ No
·		<del></del>	_
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration 30 days prior to the change?		mitted -  Yes	□No
to any prior to the change.			
	_		
//s//Michael Storino	01/07/2013		
//s//Michael StorinoInspector's Name (Please Print)	01/07/2013  Date of Inspection		
		pection	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	pection	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)  Inspector's Signature  COMMENTS: Michael Storino conducted an annual INS3 for the faci	Date of Inspection  Approximate Date of Next Insplity and observed VE test of cemer	nt & flyash s	
Inspector's Name (Please Print)  Inspector's Signature	Date of Inspection  Approximate Date of Next Insplity and observed VE test of cemer	nt & flyash s	

One front end loader: 2006 John Deere 544J