

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	. , , ,	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	, , ,
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT N	IO:
AIRS ID#: 1010037 DAT	ΓΕ: <u>4/5/07</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:35</u>	DEPART: <u>11:50</u>
FACILITY NAME: RIN	NKER MATERIALS OF FL I	NC DBA KEYS CONC	
FACILITY LOCATION	18430 COUNTY LIN	E ROAD	
	MASARYKTOWN	34610	
RESPONSIBLE OFFICE	IAL: JEFFREY PORTER	PHON	NE: (561)820-8415
CONTACT NAME: JR Hatfield		PHON	NE:
REMITTANCE YEAR:	ENTIT	TLEMENT PERIOD: 5/28/200 (effective of	
		,	(
PART I: INSPECTION	COMPLIANCE STATUS (check only one box)	
IN COMPLIANC	CE MINOR Non-COM	MPLIANCE SIGNIFICA	ANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: TESTING/RE (check ☑ appropriate		<u>EMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, 1	F.A.C.
	E 00x(cs))		
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emiss	sions tests conducted during th	nis site visit according to EPA M	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
			⊠Yes □ No
2. Are emissions from		ers) and other enclosed storage	and conveying equipment
controlled to the ex	xtent necessary to limit visible		? ⊠Yes □ No
controlled to the example of the controlled to the con	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust co	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the le	?? \(\times Yes \) No oading of the silo conducted
controlled to the example 3. During visible eminates a rate that is repunless such rate is	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust coresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice?	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the lo loading rate, or at least at the m	?? ⊠Yes □ No oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate,
controlled to the example 3. During visible eminated a rate that is repunless such rate is 4. Are emissions from	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust coresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice?	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the loading rate, or at least at the moreoneeration controlled by the silo	oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate,
controlled to the example of the exa	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust coresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice?	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the loading rate, or at least at the moreoperation controlled by the silo estions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a	Yes No oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate, Wes No dust collector? (If answer unswer is "No" then Yes No
controlled to the example of the exa	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust corresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice?	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the loading rate, or at least at the moperation controlled by the silo estions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a controlled by the visible emissions test?	Yes No oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate,
controlled to the example of the exa	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust corresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice? m the weigh hopper (batcher) "Yes", then continue on to quand continue on to question 5. ng operation in operation duri ble emissions test, was the bar	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the lo loading rate, or at least at the moreoperation controlled by the silo estions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a controlled by the silo estions 4.a and 4.b below. If a controlled by the silo estions 4.a and 4.b below. If a controlled by the silo estions 4.a and 4.b below. If a controlled by the silo estions test?	Yes No oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate,
controlled to the example of the exa	xtent necessary to limit visible issions tests of the silo dust coresentative of the normal silo unachievable in practice?	e emissions to 5 percent opacity ollector exhaust points was the le loading rate, or at least at the more operation controlled by the silo estions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If a controlled by the visible emissions test?	Yes No oading of the silo conducted ninimum 25 tons per hour rate, Yes No dust collector? (If answer answer is "No" then Yes No Yes No normal batching rate and collector, which is separate

PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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 t 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?					
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?	to ⊠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 test was completed?					
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.)	le 🗌				
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary ☒; 2) a relocatable ☐; or does it have: 3) both, stationary and relocatable 	ing □Yes ⊠ No □Yes ⊠ No				

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)						
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))						
T. (P. 1. C. 200 200 (1) (1) F. (C.)						
	<u>Unconfined Emissions</u> – (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:	asonable precautions to control uncommed					
	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		⊠Yes □ No				
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-supp						
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 redu	⊠Yes □ No					
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind br						
particulate matter from stock piles?						
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emi	issions at the drop point to the truck?	⊠Yes ∐ No				
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Rule	e 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?						
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?						
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most						
recent notification form?						
d) If you answered <u>YES</u> 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.						
Neal B. Janis	4/5/07					
		<u> </u>				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection					
	1 year					
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	<u> </u>				
	TI T					
COMMENTS:						