

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVE	RY (CI)		
I	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO	:		
AIRS ID#: 1150008 DAT	E: <u>03/20/2008</u>	ARRIVE: ~10:00 am	DEPART: <u>~10:20 am</u>		
FACILITY NAME: SAR.	ASOTA PRECAST PRODU	ICT			
FACILITY LOCATION:	1415 Myrtle St				
	SARASOTA 34234-	-4723			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED	REPRESENTATIVE: MI	ICHAEL MCCARTHY <b>PHONE</b>	<b>2:</b> (941)355-4380		
CONTACT NAME:		PHONE	):		
<b>ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:</b> 7/1/2005 / 7/1/2010					
	(effective date) (end date)				
PART I: INSPECTION (	COMPLIANCE STATUS (	(check <b>o</b> nly one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCI		· <u> </u>	NT Non-COMPLIANCE		
		_			
DADT II. TESTING/DEC	ADDREEDING DECITOR	EMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A	A C		
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate		<u> ENIEM 15</u> – Ruit 02-270.414, f.a	A.C.		
Stack Emissions					
1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)?	ons tests conducted during th	is site visit according to EPA Me	thod 9 (Ref.: Chapter Yes No		
		ers), and other enclosed storage are emissions to 5 percent opacity?			
controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity?					
unless such rate is u	nachievable in practice?				
to this question is "	Yes", then continue on to que	operation controlled by the silo duestions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If ans	wer is "No" then		
a) Was the batching	g operation in operation durir				
	le emissions test, was the bat	ching rate representative of the ne	ormal batching rate and		
5. If emissions from the	ne weigh hopper (batcher) op	eration are controlled by a dust co	ollector, which is separate		
5. If emissions from the from the silo dust co	ne weigh hopper (batcher) op ollector, are the visible emiss	peration are controlled by a dust co	ollector, which is separate		

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 annual compliance demonstration? (Rule 62-297.310(7)(a), F.A.C.)	
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?  b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form submittal date?	□Yes □ No n - □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 60days prior the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date?	
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 test was completed?	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
	le 🗌
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>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? (<i>Please check ☑ only one box.</i>)</li> <li>If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral process plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)————————————————————————————————————</li></ol>	ing ☐Yes ☑ No ☐Yes ☐ No
(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? ( <i>Please check ☒ only one box.</i> )  2. If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral process plants using individual air general permits at the same location? ( <i>If your answer to this question is YES</i> , <i>then proceed to questions 2.a</i> ), <i>thru 2.d</i> ), <i>below.</i> )————————————————————————————————————	ing  □Yes □ No □Yes □ No □Yes □ No
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>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? (<i>Please check ☑ only one box.</i>)</li> <li>If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral process plants using individual air general permits at the same location? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)————————————————————————————————————</li></ol>	ing    Yes   No     Yes   No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)						
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))						
<u>Unconfined Emissions</u> – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)  1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant to	ake reasonable precautions to control unconfined					
emissions by:	are reasonable precautions to control ancommed					
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and						
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards?						
application of water or environmentally safe dust- emissions?	⊠Yes □ No					
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other						
	re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? \(\simeg Yes \square No\) 4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of					
particulate matter from stock piles?		⊠ves □ No				
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitiga						
<u> </u>						
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES -	- Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.					
A. New or Modified Process Equipment						
1. Circ- the last inspection has them been						
Since the last inspection has there been     a) installation of any new process equipment?		⊠Yes □ No				
b) alterations to existing process equipment without r						
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most						
recent notification form?						
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						
local program office.		M162 110				
Debbie Telemeco Anders, ESII	03/20/2008					
		_				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection					
	~ 2008					
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	_				
COMMENTS: INS 2 Debbie Telemeco Anders did a walk through inspection of the facility. The facility has NOT DONE						

**COMMENTS:** INS 2. Debbie Telemeco Anders did a walk through inspection of the facility. The facility has NOT DONE compliance testing of the emission units since May 11, 2005.