NUMBROL PROTECTION
Same Care
FLORIDA

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVER ARMS COMPLAINT NO:	Y (CI)		
AIRS ID#: 1150150 DATE: <u>2/27/2012</u>	ARRIVE: <u>3:40 pm</u>	DEPART: <u>4:00 pm</u>		
FACILITY NAME: PYRAMID PAVERS, LLC				
FACILITY LOCATION: 510 Paul Morris Dr				
ENGLEWOOD 34223	3-3960			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: BRA Email: walker705@verizon.net CONTACT NAME: BRUCE NILES Email: bniles07@verizon.net ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 8/3/2008 / 8/3/2013 (effective date) (end date)	Mobile:	: (941)474-2323 : (941)474-2323		
Facility Section				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☑ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE				
DADT H. ONGETE INTRODUCTORY MEETING		_		
PART II: ONSITE INTRODUCTORY MEETING 1. Name(s) of facility representative(s): Brad Walker		(check \square only one box for each question)		
 Brief Notes: 2. Is the Authorized Representative still BRAD WALKE If no, who is?: If different, did the facility provide an administrative u 				
3. Is the facility contact still BRUCE NILES?				
 4. Will facility be conducting VE test(s) during today's ir If yes, was the compliance authority notified at least 15 	nspection? 5 days in advance?	YesNo YesNo		

Emissions Unit Section <u>1 –cement/ flyash/ slag storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection: 02/22/2012	(check 🗹 box for each d	only one question)
 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 forst execution areas of the past 4 calendar year?	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? d. Date of last VE test: 02/06/2012 	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? tons/hour	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	□ No ⊠ 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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No
PART II: STACK EMISSIONS from a silo, weigh hopper(batcher) or other		
enclosed storage and conveying equipment	(check \blacksquare box for each \bullet	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% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
 f. What was the silo loading rate? 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 1) Was the weigh hopper (batcher) in operation during the visible emissions test?		□ No
2) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate duration?	te and Yes	□ No
 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which 	tes	
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector. 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? minute	ector V 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 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? 	Yes Yes	⊠ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 No

Emissions Unit Section

PART I: <u>FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION</u>	(check 🗹 box for each c	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: <u>02/22/2012</u> 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)? 	- 🗌 Yes	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
PART II: FIELD OBSERVATIONS – Rule 62-296.414(2), F.A.C.		only one
Unconfined Emissions from Truck Loading and Unloading, Hoppers, Storage and	box for each o	question)
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 unconfinemissions by:	ned	
a. Management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the	following:	
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to 		🗌 No
control emissions?	🛛 Yes	🗌 No
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to re-optrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne.		
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 <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 <u>3 – weigh hopper subject to 5% Opacity Limit</u>

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION 1. Date of last inspection:	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)	
 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 even of evention was a VE test performed within 20 days of events. 	Yes Yes	⊠ No ⊠ No	
 c. If first year of operation, was a VE test performed within 30 days of commencing operation? N/A d. Date of last VE test: 02/14/2012 	Tes 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? tons/hour	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	☐ Yes ⊠ Yes	D No 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)? 	Xes Yes	🗌 No	
PART 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% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit?	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? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		Dection.	
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour	_		
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 to		No	
 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 		🗌 No	
duration?	· 🗌 Yes	🗌 No	
h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which			
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? minute	P 🗌 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% for the highest six-minute average.	Yes	∐ No	
 c. Did the visible emission test resulted in an opacity of // for the ingliest six-infinite average. d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 No	

Emissions Unit Section 4 –cement storage silo subject to 5% Opacity Limit

PART I: FILE REVIEW PRIOR TO INSPECTION	(check 🗹 box for each	only one question)
 Date of last inspection: <u>02/22/2012</u> 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 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ No □ No
 d. Date of last VE test: 02/03/2012 	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? <u>50</u> tons/hour 	⊠ Yes ⊠ Yes	□ 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? X/A i. Did the test report state the actual batching rate during emissions testing?	Yes Yes	D No 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)? 	Yes	🗌 No
PART 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% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? If not, what was the problem (if known)? 	Yes	🗌 No
d. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector exhaust points was the loading of the silo co		
that is representative of the normal silo loading rate? Yes No N/A – silo not load e. If silo loaded, was the minimum loading rate of 25 tons/hour achievable in practice?		No
f. What was the silo loading rate? tons/hour 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 to	\square Yes	🗌 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 ra duration?	- 🗌 Yes	🗌 No
 3) What was the batching rate? tons/hour . What was the batching duration? minu h. 1) If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector which 		
from the silo dust collector, was the visible emissions test of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust coll 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? minute	? 🗌 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?	Yes	⊠ No □ No
 b. The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six-minute average. c. Did the visible emissions test demonstrate compliance with the 5% opacity limit? d. What was the process rate? tons/hour. 	Yes	🗌 No

Facility Section (continued)

CONFIRMATION OF GENERAL PERMIT ELIGIBILITY	(1.1.1.1.7	
	(check ☑ box for each	
		question
 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	□ 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.)?		🛛 No
 b. Any emissions units or activities authorized by another air general permit where such other air ge permit and this general permit specifically allow the use of one another at the same facility? If YES, what other general permit units or activities? 		🛛 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	□ No □ No □ No □ No □ No
gal diesel/yrgal gasoline/yrMM SCF nat. gas/yrMM gal pr275,000 gal diesel/yr23,000 gal gasoline/yr44 MM SCF nat. gas/yr1.3 MM gal prop)?
4. Has the owner/operator maintained, available for inspection, site-wide records of monthly fuel cons for each consecutive 12-period for the past 5 years?		🗌 No

GENERAL CONDITIONS	(check 🗹 box for each	•
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?		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?3. Has the owner or operator allowed you, as the duly authorized representative of the Department, acces		🗌 No
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 ☑ box for each	•
1. Is the facility: stationary \boxtimes ; relocatable \square ; or consisting of both stationary and relocatable \square		1 /
concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (If only stationary, skip the followi	ng question 2.)	1
2. Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and		
soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?	🗌 Yes	No 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?		No No
b. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900		_
to the Department or Local Air Program no later than five business days following a relocation? c. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form [DEP No. 62-210.900(∐ No
to the appropriate Department or Local Air Program at least five business days prior to relocation?		🗌 No
3. If the relocatable plant was co-located at a facility with a separate air construction or air operation pe	rmit,	
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 usag If YES, what was the purpose?	ge)? 🗌 Yes	∐ No
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	•
Administrative Changes:		1
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized represent		
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions u		
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?		No No
2. If YES, did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the change?	🗌 Yes	No 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?		🛛 No 🖾 No
b. Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?c. Replacement of existing equipment with equipment that is substantially different?		🛛 No 🕅 No
d. A change in ownership?		\bowtie No
d. A change in ownership:		

4.	If the answer to any question 3a. – d. is YES, was a new registration form and the appropriate fee submit	tted	
	30 days prior to the change?	Yes	

Michael Storino, ESIII

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

02/27/2013

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

02/27/2012

COMMENTS: INS2. Facility has created and implemented a watering log; an operation/ maintenance log; and a transfer log to track and ensure reasonable precautions are being taken to control fugitive particulate matter from the site.

No