



CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) [X] COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) [ ]
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) [ ] ARMS COMPLAINT NO: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITY: Florida Rock Industries, Inc.
DBA/Site Name: Largo Redi Mix Plant
ADDRESS: 13175 95th Street North, Largo, FL
ARMS NO: 1030008 001
PERMIT NO: 1030008-003-AG
DISTRICT: Southwest
CONTACT PHONE: 813-962-3213
Expiration Date: 5/2/2012
Renewal Date: 4/2/2012
Test Date: 2/24/2000

EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION: Concrete Batch Plant: weigh hopper and truck loading hood, Controlled by a central C&W Manufacturing and Sales Company, Inc., Model CW-RA-140 Dust Collector

INSPECTION DATE: 4/7/10
INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check [ ] only one box)
[X] In Compliance; [ ] Minor Non-Compliance; [ ] Significant Non-Compliance

PART I: General Review:

1. Permit File Review [X] Yes [ ] No
2. Introduction and Entry [X] Yes [ ] No
Comments: I met with Jeff Seacrest, Plant Superintendent, who gave me a tour of the facility and provided me with the maintenance records.
3. Is the Authorized Representative still Katherine R. Chumley? [X] Yes [ ] No
Comments:
4. Is the facility contact still David Lavender? [X] Yes [ ] No
Comments:
5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? [ ] Yes [X] No
[62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]

PART II: TESTING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.

(check [ ] appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)

Compliance Demonstration

- 1. [ ] New Facilities / [ ] New Process Equipment - (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits)
Did this facility demonstrate initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. [X] Existing Facilities - (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-296.414(4)(a), F.A.C., Air General Permits)
In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted on each dust collector exhaust point within 365 days (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions compliance test? [X] Yes [ ] No
Test Reports
3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit? [X] Yes [ ] No
The last visible emission test resulted in an opacity of 0% for the highest six minute average. [62-296.414(1) F.A.C.]
4. Was the department notified at least 15 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.C.] [X] Yes [ ] No
5. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b)] [X] Yes [ ] No
6. Was the facility visible emissions test(s) conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-297.401(9)(c), F.A.C.] [X] Yes [ ] 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: TESTING REQUIREMENTS – 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
8. Are emissions from a weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer 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.) -----  Yes  No
- a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? [62-296.414(3)(c), F.A.C.] -----  Yes  No
- 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.] -----  Yes  No
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
- a) The visible emission test resulted in an opacity of \_\_\_\_\_% for the highest six minute average.
- b) Did the test indicate the facility is operating in compliance with the 5% opacity standard? -----  Yes  No

**PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.**

(check  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.**)
2. For any combination of stationary or relocatable concrete batching plants, located with other concrete batching plants or nonmetallic mineral processing plants:
- a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility? [62-210.310(5)(b)4.a., F.A.C.] -----  Yes  No
- b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel usage of all plants less than or equal to the fuel usages listed below: [62-210.310(5)(b)4.b., F.A.C.]-----  Yes  No
- 1) 275,000 gallons of diesel fuel – usage equals \_\_\_\_\_ gallons
- 2) 23,000 gallons of gasoline – usage equals \_\_\_\_\_ gallons
- 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.)
1. 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) -----  Yes  No
- a) Did the owner or operator notify the Department by telephone, e-mail, fax, or written communication 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)

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? -----  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

**PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)**

(check  appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance)

- 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

**PART V: General Procedure Requirements and Conditions**

(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 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? -----  Yes  No

**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?-----  Yes  No
    - b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?-----  Yes  No
    - c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?-----  Yes  No
    - d) Change in ownership-----  Yes  No
- If any of the answers to 1a) – 1d) is **Yes**, a new registration form and appropriate fee should have been submitted 30 days prior to the change.-----  Yes  No

**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? -----  Yes  No  
 If the answer is **Yes**, proceed to a) and b).
  - a) Did the owner or operator provide immediate notification to the Department? -----  Yes  No
  - b) Did the notification include:
    - 1. A description of and cause of noncompliance?-----  Yes  No
- 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 recurrence of the noncompliance? -----  Yes  No

**PART VI: Comments**

**O&M Plan**

The pollution control equipment shall be operated and maintained in accordance to the operation and maintenance (O&M) plan. The O&M plan shall include, but is not limited to:

- (1) Operating parameters of the pollution control device;
- (2) Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution control device as specified by the manufacturer;
- (3) Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution control device sufficient to ensure proper operation;
- (4) 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;
- (5) A record log which will indicate, at a minimum:
  - a. When maintenance and observations were performed;
  - b. What maintenance and observations were performed; and
  - c. Who performed said maintenance and observations.
  - d. Acceptable parameter ranges for each operational check.

[Pinellas County Code, Subsection 58-128]

Reviewed records for the months of January 2009 – March 2010

**Comments:**

*The facility grounds were relatively clean. They have a sweeper come in once a month and, in the meantime, they wet any loose material down with water throughout the day to prevent fugitive emissions.*

*The record logs in use were approved with their last permit renewal and were complete; however, Bill Froberg has been working with Katherine Chumley to get the maintenance logs to comply with the O&M Plan and manufacturers recommendations as the result of an enforcement case. We are currently waiting for updated logs. Per Wayne Martin, this facility is in compliance by exercising enforcement discretion.*

*Exit Interview: I informed Jeff Seacrest that the plant appeared to be in compliance at this time, however, further review of the ongoing case with the maintenance logs and O&M Plan might result in a different status.*

Shannon Ransom

**Inspector's Name**

4/7/10

**Date of Inspection**

**Inspector's Signature**

~ 4/2011

**Approximate Date of Next Inspection**

H:\USERS\WPDOCS\Airqual\Air\_Compliance\AQI\1030008 001 71136.doc