



# CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

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

**AIRS ID#:** 0250374 **DATE:** 9/12/2006 **ARRIVE:** 10:40AM **DEPART:** 11:39AM  
**FACILITY NAME:** TARMAC FLORIDA INC  
**FACILITY LOCATION:** 290 NW 171TH ST  
 MIAMI 33169-  
**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** TERRY LANCASTER **PHONE:** (954)425-4165  
**CONTACT NAME:** BRUCE HALLER **PHONE:** (954)761-19  
**REMITTANCE YEAR:** **ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:** 2/11/2005 / 2/10/2010  
 (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

FRANK DELGADO

9/12/2006

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

Date of Inspection

*Frank Delgado*

9/2007

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

**COMMENTS:** ALLEN RAINEY FROM THE FDEP SOUTHEAST DISTRICT ACCOMPANIED ME IN THIS INSPECTION ON SITE WE MET CHARLES ROBERTSON, THE FACILITY'S ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER, BRUCE HALLER, THE FACILITY'S PRODUCTION MANAGER AND MIKE RETTER, THE FACILITY'S PLANT MANAGER WE DISCUSSED THE TARMAC'S CONSENT AGREEMENT WITH THEM. THE EASTERNMOST CEMENT SILO WAS BEING LOADED WITH CEMENT AT THE TIME OF THE INSPECTION WE DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS WHILE THE SILO WAS LOADED. THEY USE A SWEEPER THREE TIMES PER WEEK TO KEEP THE ROAD IN FRONT OF THE FACILITY FREE FROM DUST.

Charles Robertson  
Environmental Engineer

Bruce Haller  
Production Manager - Southern Region



Tarmac  
Roanoke Cement  
Essex Cement  
Separation Technologies  
A Titan Group Company

Titan America LLC  
455 Fairway Drive  
Deerfield Beach, FL 33441  
Mobile: (786) 385-8350  
Fax: (954) 480-9352  
crobertson@titanamerica.com

2500 SW 2nd Avenue  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33315  
Telephone: (954) 761-1944  
Fax: (954) 760-5925  
Cellular: (954) 553-3833  
bhaller@titanamerica.com