

RECIPROCATING INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINES

COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



<u>INSPECTION</u> <u>TYPE</u> : ANNUAL (IN	S1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVI	ERY (CI)		
RE-INSPECTI	ON (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO	D:		
FACILITY: Nielsen Media Research		DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name: Nielsen Media		Southwest		
ADDRESS: 501 Brooker Creek Boulevard		CONTACT PHONE:		
Oldsmar, FL		8133663023		
ARMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	Expiration Date: 8/24/2013 Renewal Date: 7/25/2013		
1030533	1030533-001-AG			
	1000000 001 110	Test Date: none		
EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: (DQKC, DQKC, DQKC, DQKC), 1 in	Five diesel reciprocating internal combu 2008 (DQKAB).			
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check? only one box)			
7/30/10	☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Con	npliance; Significant Non-Compliance		
	PART I: General Review:			
		∑Yes ☐ No		
2. Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No		
Comments: I met with Frank Krejnicky who answered my questions, showed me to the generators, and provided me with the fuel usage log.				
3. Is the Authorized Representative still Lynn Laforce?		☐Yes ⊠No		
Comments: Lynn LaForce is no longer the Authorized Representative; it is now Sharon St. Jean.				
4. Is the facility contact still: Frank Krejnicky?				
Comments: 5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] See Comment #1.				
	RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rox(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would			
1. Is the facility using any other general permits at this location?				
[62-210.310(4)(b)1.a., F.A.C.] 2. Is the facility subject to any unit-specific applicable requirement?		Yes No		
[62-210.310(4)(b).1b., F.A.C.] 3. Does the facility operate any other emission unit that is not exempt from permitting pursuant to subsection 62-		oursuant to subsection 62-		
	F.A.C.?			
4. Was a visible emissions test(s) conduct If the answer to 4. is No, skip a)-b)	ted by the inspector during this site visit accor	ding? Yes No		
a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of% for the highest six minute average.				
b) Did the test indicate the facility is a [62296.320(b)1., F.A.C.]- See Comment #2	pperating in compliance with the = 20% opaci	ty standard? Yes No		

5. Is the total combined fuel consumption by all reciprocating internal combustion engines at the facility less than		
or equal to the fuel usages listed below?		
a) 20,000 gallons of gasoline – usage equals gallons= % of allowed	☐Yes ☐No ☐Yes ☐No	
b) 250,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals 10060 gallons = 4.024 % of allowed	Yes No	
c) 1.15 million gallons of propane – usage equals gallons= % of allowed d) 40 million standard ft³ natural gas – usage equals cubic feet= % of allowed	Yes No	
u) 40 million standard fr natural gas – usage equals cubic feet = % of anowed % of Total*		
e) Is the sum of the fuel percentages for all fuels burned by the facility less than		
or equal to 100 percent of the equivalent prorated amounts*?		
[62-210.310(4)(b)2.a. and b., F.A.C.]		
6. Is the facility maintaining records to document the fuel <u>consumption</u> , by type, on an annual basis?		
[62-210.310(4)(b)2.c., F.A.C.]	⊠Yes □No	
7. Are the records available for Department inspection and available for a period of at least five (5) years or to	⊠Yes □No	
the beginning of operation?		
[62-210.310(4)(b)2.c., F.A.C.]	Yes	
8. Is the facility complying with the objectionable odor prohibition of subsection 62-296.320(2), F.A.C.? An upwind/downwind survey of the facility was conducted. The observed parameters were:		
Downwind odor level detected (1-10); Wind direction Upwind odor level detected		
[296.320(2), F.A.C.] See comment #2		
PART III: Special Conditions And Procedures		
(check? appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)		
Administrative Changes:		
1. Were there any changes in the name, address, or phone number of the facility or authorized representative not	⊠Yes □No	
associated with a change in ownership or with a physical relocation of the facility or any emissions units or	□Yes ⊠No	
operations comprising the facility; or any other similar minor administrative change at the facility?	□NA	
2. Did the facility provide written notification within 30 days of the administrative change?		
[62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] See comment #1		
Permit Effective Period		
3. Is the general permit for this facility still within the 5 year entitlement period?		
4. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 days prior to permit expiration?		
[62-210.310(3)(a), F.A.C.] New or Modified Process Equipment / Change in Ownership		
-	☐Yes ⊠No ☐Yes ⊠No	
5. Since the last registration form submittal has there been [62-210.310 (2)(b)2, F.A.C]		
a) Installation of any new process equipment?		
b) Alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?		
d) A change in ownership?		
d) A change in ownership?		
submitted 30 days prior to the change. Was a new registration form properly submitted?		
<u>Noncompliance Notice:</u> - [62-210.310(3)(i), F.A.C.]	☐Yes ⊠No	
6. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable comply with or will be unable to comply with any		
condition or limitation of the air general permit?		
If the answer is Yes , proceed to a) and b). a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department?	Yes No	
a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department?b) Did the notification include:	☐Yes ☐No	
1. A description of and cause of noncompliance?		
2. The period of noncompliance, including dates and times; or if not corrected, the anticipated time the		
noncompliance is expected to continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent	☐Yes ☐No	
recurrence of the noncompliance?		
Maintenance:	⊠Yes □No	
1. Does the owner or operator maintain the permitted facility, emission unit, or activity in good condition?	Z 105	
[62-210.310(3)(g), F.A.C.]		

PART IV: <u>Comments</u> – List comments that p	provide detail to any violations or clarifies the inspection	
was a rather quick change; they thought they had notified ever a letter to us immediately. I informed Ms. St. Jean and Mr. Ko but my managers would make that determination. Per Wayne	te to Sharon St. Jean in February/March according to Mr. Krejnicky. It rybody, but were not aware of it being a permit condition. They will se rejnicky this could be considered minor non-compliance of the permit Martin, no enforcement will take place but a letter notifying us of the on by phone; she stated the letter will be done first thing in the morning	nd
2) The generators were not operating at the time of inspection performed.	, therefore, neither a visible emissions test nor odor survey was	
Shannon Ransom Inspector's Name		
Inspector's Signature		