

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

<b>INSPECTION TYPE</b> : ANNUAL (INS	1, INS2) 🛛 COMPLAINT/DISCOVER	Y (CI)		
RE-INSPECTIO	N (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
FACILITY: ASAP Pavers, LLC		DISTRICT:		
DBA/Site Name: Paver Source		Southwest		
<b>ADDRESS:</b> 2430 Terminal Drive		CONTACT PHONE:		
St. Petersburg, FL		727-321-4013		
ARMS NO:	PERMIT NO:	<b>Expiration Date:</b> 1/30/17		
1030549 001	1030549-001-AG	Renewal Date: 12/30/16		
1030217 001		<b>Test Date:</b> 3/6/00		
	ment Paver manufacturer: Consisting of a aggregates stored in open bins. Granular of tridge filters.			
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (cl	neck 🗆 only one box)		
9-11-13		liance; Significant Non-Compliance		
	PART I: General Review:			
1. Permit File Review		⊠Yes ☐ No		
2. Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No		
Comments: This inspection was performed in order to determine if facility has been operating within applicable regulations.  Mr. Volpe (owner) was present during the facility inspection of the emission units.				
3. Is the Authorized Representative st		⊠Yes ☐ No		
Comments: David Volpe stills the A	-	_		
The e-mail address is: dvvolpe@m				
4. Is the facility contact still: David V		⊠Yes □ No		
Comments: David Volpe stills the facility contact.  The e-mail address is: dvvolpe@msn.com				
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.]	ic facility provide all administrative update	within 50 days.		
DADT II. T	ECTING DEATHDEMENTS Date (2.20)	114 E A C		
	ESTING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.4 x(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would i			
Compliance Demonstration  1.  □ New Facilities / □ New Process Eq. Did this facility demonstrate initial comp  2.  ☑ Existing Facilities – (permitted purs In order to demonstrate annual compliant collector exhaust point within 365 days	uipment— (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.4 obliance no later than 30 days after beginning of uant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air Gennce, was an annual visible emissions test conduction (annually thereafter) of the previous visible em	A14(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits) operation?		
2 Do the substitut I state	Test Reports	situ limit?		
	lemonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opac on 3/1/13 resulted in an opacity of <u>0</u> % for the l C.1			
	days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.	C.] \(\times Yes \(\prisin No\)		
	ne department as soon as practical, but no later			
6. Was the facility visible emissions test(s)	conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-2	97.401(9)(c), F.A.C] \(\big \) Yes \(\big \) No		
7. 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, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,				

PART II: <u>TESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.		
(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)		
unless such rate is unachievable in practice? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.]	- ⊠ Yes ∐ No	
to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 8.a) and 8.b) below. If answer is "No" then		
skip to question 9.)		
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [62-296.414(3)(c), F.A.C.]		
9. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from		
the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration? [62-296.414(3)(d), F.A.C.]	- ☐ Yes ⊠ No	
10. Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according to EPA Method 9?	- ☐ Yes ⊠ No	
<ul> <li>a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of <u>n/a</u> % for the highest six minute average.</li> <li>b) Did the test indicate the facility is operating in compliance with the 5% opacity standard?</li> </ul>	- Yes No	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A	C	
(check $\square$ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	)	
1. Is this facility: 1) a ⊠ stationary; 2) a ☐ relocatable; or does it have: 3) both, ☐ stationary and relocatable concrete batching and/or nonmetallic mineral processing plants? (Please check ☐ only one box.)	le	
2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concrete batching or nonmetallic mineral processing plants:	g plants	
a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility? [62-210.310(5)(b)4.a., F.A.C.]b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to the fuel usages	- Yes No	
listed below: [62-210.310(5)(b)4.b., F.A.C.]	- Yes No	
<ol> <li>275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals gallons</li> <li>23,000 gallons of gasoline – usage equals gallons</li> </ol>		
3) 44 million standard cubic feet on natural gas – usage equals cubic feet		
4) 1.3 million gallons of propane – usage equals gallons		
5) or an equivalent prorated amount if multiple fuels are used onsite – usage equals% of all	fuels	
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant submitting this registration maintain records to account for site-wide fuel consumption for each calendar month and each consecutive twelve (12) months, and are these records available for Department inspection for a period of at least five (5) years?		
[62-210.310(5)(b)4.d., F.A.C.]	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Relocation Notification - (Rule 61-210.310(5)(b)3.b., F.A.C.)		
<ol> <li>Is the relocatable concrete batching plant used to mix cement and soil for onsite soil augmentation or stabilization?—(if your answer is YES, please proceed to 1. a) thru 1.b) below)</li></ol>	- ☐ Yes ⊠ No	
at least one (1) 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 no later than five (5) business days following a relocation?	- Yes No	
If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below		
2. Did the owner or operator transmit a Facility Relocation Notification Form (DEP No. 62-210.900(6)) at least five (5) business days prior to relocation?	- Yes No	
PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)		
(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance	e)	
1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions	⊠ Yes □ No	
Which of the following methods are used:		
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?		
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?4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	⊠ Yes ∐ No	

PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u> (check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)			
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			
PART V: General Procedure Requirements and Conditions			
(check $\square$ 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 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? [62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.] Yes No			
Permit Effective Period – [62-210.310(3)(a), F.A.C.]  1. Is the general permit for this facility still within the 5 year effective period?   Yes  No			
2. Did the facility submit the new re-registration form at least 30 days prior to permit expiration?			
New or Modified Process Equipment or Change in Ownership			
1. Since the last registration form submittal has there been [62-210.310 (2)(b)2]  a) installation of any new process equipment?			
Noncompliance Notice: - [62-210.310(3)(i), F.A.C.]  1. Did the facility have any instances where they were unable to comply with or will be unable to comply with any condition or limitation of the air general permit?			
continue, and steps being taken to reduce, eliminate, and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance?			
PART VI: Comments			
<ul> <li>O&amp;M Plan</li> <li>The pollution control equipment shall be operated and maintained in accordance to the operation and maintenance (O&amp;M) plan. The O&amp;M plan shall include, but is not limited to: <ol> <li>Operating parameters of the pollution control device;</li> <li>Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution control device as specified by the manufacturer;</li> <li>Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control device sufficient to ensure proper operation;</li> <li>A list of the type and quantity of the required spare parts for the pollution control device which are stored on the premises of the permit applicant;</li> <li>A record log which will indicate, at a minimum: <ol> <li>When maintenance and observations were performed;</li> <li>What maintenance and observations were performed; and</li> <li>Who performed said maintenance and observations.</li> <li>Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check.</li> </ol> </li> <li>[Pinellas County Code, Subsection 58-128]</li> </ol></li></ul> <li>Comments: Reviewed records for the months of 10/1/11 through 9/10/13, indicated emission unit in compliance.</li>			
Mr. Volpe stated the silo has been pneumatic loaded once a month. At the time. I was not able to perform a visible emissions test			
at the time, as no tanker was onsite. Mr. Volpe stated they would not be receiving any more pneumatic loading for the silo today.			

I asked Mr. Volpe to contact AQ Division office next time they plan to load silo.

xit Interview: During the closing conference, I told	Mr. Volpe this emission unit appears to be in compliance.
Mila Oie Thomas	0.11.12
Mike Ojo Thomas	9-11-13  Pote of Ingression
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
H:\USERS\WPDOCS\Airqual\Air_Compliance	

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06