



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT

## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST



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

**AIRS ID#:** 7775359 **DATE:** 10/29/2008 **ARRIVE:** 9:25 am **DEPART:** 9:49am  
**FACILITY NAME:** BRADENTON YARD  
**FACILITY LOCATION:** 3302 East 81st Court  
BRADENTON 34211  
**OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:** YVONNE TUCKER **PHONE:** (561)478-9980  
**CONTACT NAME:** Mike Mahoney **PHONE:** (561)784-2070  
**ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 9/7/2006 / 9/7/2011  
(effective date) (end date)

**PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS** (check ☒ only one box)

☒ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE

**PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.**

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

**Stack Emissions**

1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and other enclosed storage and conveying equipment controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. 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, unless such rate is unachievable in practice?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer to this question is “Yes”, then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If answer is “No” then skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
5. 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 conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued)**

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

**Compliance Demonstration - (Rule 62-296.401(5)(i), F.A.C.)**

1. Is each dust collector exhaust point tested according to the visible emissions limiting standard as part of the annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**New Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)**

2. Did this facility demonstrate:
- a) initial compliance no later than 30 days after beginning operation?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits)**

3. In order to demonstrate annual compliance, was an annual visible emissions test conducted 60 days prior to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Test Reports – (Rules 62-213.440, F.A.C. and 62-297.310(8)(b), F.A.C.)**

4. Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the test was completed?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.**

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

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. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processing plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (*If your answer to this question is YES, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.*)----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- a) Are there any additional nonexempt units located at this facility?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) Is the total combined annual facility-wide fuel oil usage of all plants less than 240,000 gallons per calendar year?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- c) Is the quantity of material processed less than ten million tons per calendar year?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- d) Is the fuel oil sulfur content 0.5% by weight or less?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for:
- a) fuel consumption on a monthly basis?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b) material processed on a monthly basis?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

**PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)**

(check ☒ appropriate box(es))

**Unconfined Emissions** – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)

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

**PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.**

**A. New or Modified Process Equipment**

1. Since the last inspection 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 substantially different than that noted on the most recent notification form?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - d) If you answered **YES** to any of the above, did the owner submit a new and complete notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or local program office?----- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Wendy D. Simmons

10/29/2008

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

10/29/2012

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** This facility was registered in 8/7/06. Entitlement began 09/07/06. No inspections have ever been conducted at this facility and VE's have never been conducted either. A single EU a Belgrade Steel Tank Baghouse is listed. This facility was not operational. The property was being leased for the office space by a landscape company called "TruSrapes". According to Ms. Kristin Llorca, the facility was never completed "they never operated, and never finished moving in". The building and property is now leased by TruScapes. Tru Scapes has been on property for 1 month. They requested silo be removed, Prestige said, " No". Need to contact Prestige to find out if they want to relinquish the permit. On 12/16/2008 at 1:23 pm I contacted Prestige about their plans for keeping this facility permit active. I spoke with Mr. Brian Mahoney. He stated he did not want to relinquish the Bradenton yard facility entitlement; Air Permit No. 7775359-001-AG. I asked Mr. Mahoney to submit a letter to DEP--SWD stating that information and requesting a waiver from conducting testing. Mr. Mahoney stated his brother (Mike) would be back next week and he would draft the letter for DEP. Brian also stated he would have Mike notify me of the status for the Sumter County Trinity facility Id#7775484-00-AG. At 2:26 pm on 12-16-08, Mr. Mike Mahoney contacted me to confirm the Bradenton Yard facility will keep its current permit active and will submit a letter to DEP to confirm that. I provided my email address and informed Mr. Mahoney the company will need to notify DEP prior to starting up the facility. He stated be was aware of that requirement. Photos were taken during my visit at this facility and are attached to this report.