



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
 RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:

AIRS ID#: 1150150	DATE: <u>4/15/2011</u>	ARRIVE: <u>~7:50 am</u>	DEPART: <u>~8:45 am</u>
FACILITY NAME: PYRAMID PAVERS, LLC			
FACILITY LOCATION: 510 Paul Morris Dr ENGLEWOOD 34223-3960			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: BRAD WALKER Email: walker705@verizon.net		PHONE: (941)474-2323 Mobile:	
CONTACT NAME: BRUCE NILES Email: bniles07@verizon.net		PHONE: (941)474-2323 Mobile:	
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/3/2008 / 8/3/2013 (effective date) (end date)			

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)

1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brad Walker
 Brief Notes: _____

2. Is the Authorized Representative still BRAD WALKER? ----- Yes ..No
 If no, who is?: _____
 If different, did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? ----- Yes ..No

3. Is the facility contact still BRUCE NILES? ----- Yes ..No
 If no, who is?: _____

4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's inspection? ----- Yes ..No
 If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 days in advance? ----- Yes ..No

Emissions Unit Section

1 –cement/ flyash/ slag storage silo subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check only one box for each question)

- 1. Date of last inspection: 11/30/2010
- 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? ----- Yes No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
b. If tested: (0)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- N/A Yes No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? N/A

PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.

(check only one box for each question)

Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards

- 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? ----- Yes No
 - 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? ----- 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? ----- 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 not being taken:
 - a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 - b. If tested: (0)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- Yes No
 - c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? Silo had a breach in diagonal seam; has since been fixed (welded w/ 2 patches) and observed no VE throughout 30-minute observaiton period today.

Emissions Unit Section

2 –sand/stone storage area; yard area subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check only one box for each question)

- 1. Date of last inspection: 12/30/2010
- 2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? ----- Yes No
If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
b. If tested: (_____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- N/A Yes No
c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? _____

PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.

(check only one box for each question)

Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards

- 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? ----- Yes No
 - 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? ----- 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? ----- 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 not being taken:
 - a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 - b. If tested: (_____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- Yes No
 - c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? partially managing road/ stockpiles/ yard area.

Emissions Unit Section
3 –weigh hopper subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check only one box for each question)

1. Date of last inspection: 12/30/2010
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? ----- Yes No
 If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 b. If tested: (5)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- N/A Yes No
 c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? _____

PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.

(check only one box for each question)

Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards

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? ----- Yes No
 - 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? ----- 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? ----- 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 not being taken:
- a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 - b. If tested: ()% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- Yes No
 - c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? _____

Emissions Unit Section
4 –cement storage silo subject to Reasonable Precautions

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION

(check only one box for each question)

1. Date of last inspection: 12/30/2010
2. Did the emissions unit use reasonable precautions during the last inspection? ----- Yes No
 If not: a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 b. If tested: (<5)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- N/A Yes No
 c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? FYI: new silo; white cement.

PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.

(check only one box for each question)

Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and Conveying Equipment, Conveyor Drop Points, Roads, Parking Areas, Stock Piles, and Yards

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? ----- Yes No
 - 2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control emissions? ----- 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? ----- 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 not being taken:
 - a. Did the inspector perform a general VE test (20% opacity)? ----- Yes No
 - b. If tested: (____)% opacity. Were the visible emissions < 20% opacity? ----- Yes No
 - c. What caused the problem(s) (if known)? No problems w/ this silo at this time; MNC 11/30/2010 when emissions were observed from the pressurerelief valve; bags were clogged; cleaned bags -> restarted test -> still emissions (reduced) from relief valve -> required to fix and maintain -> retest which they did 12/30/2010.

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

(check only one box for each 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? ----- Yes No
 - b. 25 tons per year or more of any combination of hazardous air pollutants? ----- Yes No
 - 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 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
 - b. 23,000 gallons of gasoline? ----- Yes No
 - c. 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas? ----- Yes No
 - d. 1.3 million gallons of propane? ----- Yes No
 - e. Or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite (use equation below)? ----- Yes No
$$\frac{\text{gal diesel/yr}}{275,000 \text{ gal diesel/yr}} + \frac{\text{gal gasoline/yr}}{23,000 \text{ gal gasoline/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM SCF nat. gas/yr}}{44 \text{ MM SCF nat. gas/yr}} + \frac{\text{MM gal propane/yr}}{1.3 \text{ MM gal propane/yr}} \leq 1.00?$$

4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel consumption 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
 - 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
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? ----- Yes No

RELOCATABLE PLANT:

(check only one box for each question)

- 1. Is the facility: stationary ; relocatable ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? *(If only stationary, skip the following 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 Local Air Program by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication at least one business day prior to changing location? ----- Yes No
 - b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? ---- Yes No
 - c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(6)] to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation? --- Yes 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 long it was co-located at the permitted facility? ----- Yes No
 If YES, were any periods more than 6 months in duration? ----- Yes No

CHANGES

(check only one box for each question)

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? ----- 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
 - d. A change in ownership? ----- Yes No
- 4. If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submitted 30 days prior to the change? ----- Yes No

Michael Storino

4/15/2011

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

12/30/2011

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: CI w/ VE of EU-001 (old silo, gray cement). Report writeup by MS and SMC.

MS observed unloading of ~27.52 tons cement between ~8:00 am and ~8:45 am. VE were documented for the first 30-minutes; ~0% opacity throughout the observation period.

" Inspection is in response to a complaint of emissions emanating from the grey portland cement silo on 4/13/11. On 4/14/11 at approximately 3 p.m, I visited the complainant's business and spoke with Brian Bishop. He explained that there had been several previous emissions from Pyramid Pavers and that he was concerned with the potential health risks and general disruption to his business.

I visited the subject site and spoke with the facility owner Mr. Brad Walker regarding the incident that occurred on 4/13/11. Mr. Walker acknowledged that there was a failure of a manufactured weld along the top of his grey portland cement silo which resulted in uncontrolled visible emissions from his silo (EU001). According to Mr. Walker, he was in a meeting at the time of the occurrence when one of his employees made him aware of the problem. Mr. Walker stated that once he knew of the issue, he immediately left his meeting and inspected the silo. He further stated the cause of the emissions to be a crack in the silo and he repaired by welding the seam. He said that he then tested the repair, found it to be adequate and had the truck complete the transfer without further incident. Mr. Walker stated he went and spoke with his neighbor, apologized and explained that the emissions were due to equipment failure.

Mr. Walker acknowledged that he should have notified our office of the problem immediately and will do so in the future. He explained that he spoke with his grey portland cement supplier and reported that the truck driver failed to immediately notify him of the emissions. I discussed that Pyramid Pavers is responsible for the emissions and should have a staff member monitoring the transfer in the event there is a problem so they may shut it down. He acknowledged that he would have staff provide better oversight of the transfers in the future.

On 4/15/11 I conducted a facility inspection and VE test on EU 001 and confirmed that the repairs were adequate with 0% opacity."
MS