

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INS	SPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/I	DISCOVERY (CI) [.AINT NO:		
ΑIJ	RS ID#: 7775348 DA	ΓΕ: <u>12-14-2011</u>	ARRIVE:	DEP	ART:	
FACILITY NAME: LAROCCO CCB PLANT-KEY LARGO						
FA	CILITY LOCATION	: 743 Largo Road				
		KEY LARGO 33	036			
CO	VNER/AUTHORIZEI Email: DNTACT NAME: Al Email: TITLEMENT PERIC		013	PHONE: (305)4: Mobile: PHONE: (305)4: Mobile:		
Facility Section PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE						
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING (check ✓ only one box for each question)						
	Name(s) of facility rep Brief Notes:	resentative(s): <u>Allison Lar</u>	occo, Frank A. Reiner		oox for each	(question)
	Is the Authorized Repr If no, who is?:	esentative still ALLISON I	LAROCCO?		X Yes	□No
3.		ility provide an administrat till ALLISON LAROCCO				□No □No
		ting VE test(s) during toda ance authority notified at lea				□No □No

Emissions Unit Section 1 –CCB Plant-#1 of 2 - 10 CY portable Silos w/baghouse subject to 5% Opacity Limit

1.	Date of last inspection: 07-09-09 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 operation?	box for each Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	only one question) No No No No No No No No	
PA	ART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check ☑ box for each	only one 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 0 % for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	Yes Yes	☐ No	
	d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted at a rate			
	that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? \boxtimes Yes \square No \square N/A – silo not loa e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		pection. No	
	f. What was the silo loading rate? <u>26.2</u> tons/hour g. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	
	If YES, then continue on to questions $g(1) - g(3)$ below. If answer NO, then skip $g(1) - g(3)$ and go to	h		
	 Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test? During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate 	ite and	∐ No	
	duration?3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minu		☐ No	
	h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which	h is separate		
	from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust col conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration 2) What was the batching rate? tons/hour. What was the batching duration? minut	? Yes	☐ No	
2.	Was a visible emissions test conducted by the inspector for this unit during this site visit?	⊠ Yes	□ No	
	 a. Was the visible emissions test conducted according to EPA Method 9? b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0 % for the highest six-minute average. 		∐ No	
	 c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? <u>26.2</u> tons/hour. 	Yes Yes	☐ No	

Facility Section (continued)

<u>C(</u>	ONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY			only one question)
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?	\boxtimes	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 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 gene 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?	- - -	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 propared	<u>ane/yr</u> ie/yr	<u>≤</u> 1.00	?
4.	Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consum for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		Yes	☐ No
GENERAL CONDITIONS (check ☑ only one box for each question)				
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
3	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?		Yes	☐ No
	to the facility at reasonable times to inspect and test and to determine compliance with the air general		Ves	□ No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:		(check ☑ only one box for each question)		
1. Is the facility: stationary : relocatable				
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cemen soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?(If YES, answer 2. a and 2.b; if NO, answer question 2.c bel		- Yes	⊠ No	
 a. Did the owner or operator notify the appropriate Department e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business. b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation I 	ent or Local Air Program by telephone, ss day prior to changing location? Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6	5)]	□ No	
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation N to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least	Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6))]	□ No□ No	
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation permit, and the relocatable batch plant is not included as an emissions unit in that separate permit: a. Was the relocatable batch plant being used for a non-routine purpose (i.e, there is no repeated usage)? Yes No				
If YES, what was the purpose? b. Were records kept by the owner/operator to indicate how co-located at the permitted facility?		Yes - Yes	□ No □ No	
ow word				
CHANGES (check ✓ only one				
Administrative Changes: 1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility? Yes No 2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of 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?			NoNoNoNoNo	
4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new reg 30 days prior to the change?		mitted -	☐ No	
Barbara Nevins	12-14-2011			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
Barbara Nevins	12-14-2012			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Ins			

COMMENTS: 27 minutes into the VE test concrete dust emitted from the inspection hatch on top of the unit. Loading the silo was stopped for about an hour while the hatch was resealed. Temporary repairs of the hatch seal were made. Ms. Larocco said that a new gasket will be purchased and installed. I asked to be notified when those repairs were completed. The loading and VE testing recommenced at approximately minute 28. During the entire test, zero emissions were observed from the baghouse.

I noted that there are two silos, EUs, in ARMS for this facility. Ms. Larocco said there has never been more that one, and always this same portable silo. I changed EU 002 status to inactive in the ARMS system.

My schedule did not allow me to attend last year's VE test.



Inspection hatch location, on top



Baghouse; emissions, if any, would exit around the bottom