

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INS	INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ⊠ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) □					
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:					
FA	CILITY: Davis Concrete, Inc.	DISTRICT:				
DB	A/Site Name: Clearwater Plant	Southwest				
AD	DRESS: 1670 Sunshine Drive	CONTACT PHONE:				
	Clearwater, FL	727-733-3141				
ARMS NO:		PERMIT NO: Expiration Date: 7/21/2012				
1030521 001		1030521-001-AG	Renewal Date: 6/21/2012			
1030321 001		100021 001 110	Test Date: 7/2/2000			
<i>EMISSION UNIT DESCRIPTION:</i> Cemen 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 (check □ only one box)				
		☐ In Compliance; ☐ Minor Non-Compliance; ☐ Significant Non-Compliance				
		PART I: General Review:				
1.	Permit File Review		⊠Yes □ No			
2.	Introduction and Entry		⊠Yes □ No			
	Comments: Wayne Martin and I met with Randy Douglas who gave us a tour of the facility.					
3.	Is the Authorized Representative still L. Douglas Davis?					
	Comments:					
4.	Is the facility contact still L. Dougla	□Yes ⊠ No				
Comments: Randy Douglas is the new facility contact.						
5.	[62-210.310(2)(d), F.A.C.]					
Randy Davis stated he would provide a letter to us within 30 days.						
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)						
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.	2. \(\sum \) 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? \(\sum \) Yes \(\subseteq \) No					
	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	A.C.] Yes No			
5.	Was the required test report filed with test was completed? [62-297.310(8)(b)	the department as soon as practical, but no late	er than 45 days after the			
6.	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			
	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.]				
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				
a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? [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.]				
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?				
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.)				
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.]				
listed below: [62-210.310(5)(b)4.b., F.A.C.]				
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				
<u>Relocation Notification</u> - (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)				
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?				
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?				
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?				
PART IV: Unconfined Emissions - 62-296.414(2)				
(check \square 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?				
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 \(\Bar{\Bar{\Bar{B}}}\) 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)				
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of				
particulate matter from stock piles? \boxtimes Yes \square No b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? \boxtimes Yes \square No				
10) use of spray our, chare, or partial enclosure to margare 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 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				
Comment: Randy Davis stated he would provide written notification within 30 days.				
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? \boxtimes Yes \square 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?				
d) Change in ownership \square Yes \boxtimes No If any of the answers to $1a - 1$ d is Yes, a new registration form and appropriate fee should				
have been submitted 30 days prior to the change \square Yes \square 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?				
PART VI: Comments				
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				
Comments:				
Facility O & M record logs matched approved plan in file. Facility is in compliance.				

Exit Interview:	
Randy Douglas was informed the emission unit was in compliance.	
Shannon Ransom	_ 12/3/09
Inspector's Name	Date of Inspection
	_ 12/10
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection

4 of 3 Revised 01/05/06