

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☐ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐				
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:				
FACILITY: Davis Concrete, Inc.	DISTRICT:			
DBA/Site Name: Clearwater Plant		Southwest		
ADDRESS: 968 Douglas Avenue		CONTACT PHONE:		
Dunedin, FL		727-733-3141		
ARMS NO:	PERMIT NO: Expiration Date: 7/21/12			
1030521 001	1030521-001-AG Renewal Date: 6/21/12			
		Test Date: VE test on 02/06/08		
<i>EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Cement Storage Silo No. 1: 350 Barrel Capacity Silo, Emissions Controlled by a Stephens Manufacturing Company, Model SV-170 Baghouse. Materials are loaded into site-mix truck with emissions controlled by an enclosure				
INSPECTION DATE:	INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	$peck \square only one box)$		
10/09/08	☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Compl	iance; Significant Non-Compliance		
	PART I: General Review:			
1. Permit File Review		∑Yes ☐ No		
2. Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No		
Comments: Wayne Martin and I attempted to inspect this facility on 10/08/08. The secretary was the only employee on premises, she was not able to leave her post to guide our physical inspection of the site nor did she have access to the needed records. The inspection was performed on 10/09/08. Randy Davis showed us the silos/yard and made the records available. Mr. Davis was informed of the section of the Rule 62-210.310 that states the Depts. right to inspect a facility at reasonable times, i.e. normal operating hours. Mr. Davis has stated that he will make the records accessible to the secretary at all times but insists that a Dept. inspector be accompanied during the site inspection. 3. Is the Authorized Representative still L. Douglas Davis? Comments: 4. Is the facility contact still L. Douglas Davis? Comments: 5. If the answer to 3 or 4 is "No", did the facility provide an administrative update within 30 days? Yes No				
[62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]				
	<u>ESTING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296. x(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would i			
(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. □ 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 tested within 365 days (annually thereafter) of the previous visible emissions compliance test?				
Test Reports 3. Do the submitted visible emission tests demonstrate compliance with the 5 percent opacity limit?				
4. Was the department notified at least 15 days prior to the test? [62-297.310(4)(a)9. F.A.C.]				
See comment #1				

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)		
5.	Was the required test report filed with the department as soon as practical, but no later than 45 days after the	
6.	test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b) \boxtimes Yes \square No Was the facility visible emissions test(s) conducted according to EPA Method 9? [62-297.401(9)(c), F.A.C] \boxtimes Yes \square No	
	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? [62-296.414(3), F.A.C.]	
8. 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 8.a) and 8.b) below. If answer is "No" then skip to question 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.]	
See comment #2. 10. Was a visible emissions test(s) conducted by the inspector during this site visit according?		
	PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.310(5)(b), F.A.C.	
1.	(check □ appropriate box(es), if a shaded box is checked, this would indicate noncompliance) 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.		
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.]	
1.	Relocation Notification - (Rule 61-210.310(5)(b)3.b., F.A.C.) 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)	
2.	If your answer to number 1. above is NO, proceed to 2. below 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?	

PART IV: <u>Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)</u>			
(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			
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?			
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			
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 \square No			
b) use of spruy our, chaice, or partial enclosure to margane emissions at the drop point to the track.			
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 change 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 \Bar{\text{Y}} Yes \Bar{\text{N}} 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 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? 🔲 Yes 🔯			
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement? 🗌 Yes 🖂 N			
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 the any of the answers to $1a$) – 1) d is \underline{Yes} to any, a new registration form and appropriate fee should			
have been submitted 30 days prior to the change No			
<u>Noncompliance Notice:</u> - [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? \sum 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			

<u>O&M Plan</u>				
plan shall include, but is not limited to: Operating parameters of the pollution control device; Time table for the routine maintenance of the pollution Time table for routine periodic observations of the pollution 	ation control device sufficient to ensure proper operation; as for the pollution control device which are stored on the premises of the med; med; and ons.			
Reviewed records for the months of:01/02/07 to 10/08/08				
Comments:				
1) There is no indication in the files of notification of the late	est V.E. test.			
2) The emissions from the weigh hopper are confined by an e	enclosure.			
copied (pre-filled in) for the silo#, level ind., vent and line pr	, the silo fill records for the period from 01/02/07 to 10/18/07 were ressure columns. Furthermore, the silo fill records stop on 02/06/08. 18. The records begin again in June (06/08) Restated: the silo fill records 6/01/08.			
Chris R. Brodeur	10/09/08			
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection			
	10/09			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06