

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 0250478 DATE: 7/30/2008 ARRIVE: 11:15 AM DEPART: 11:20 AM
FACILITY NAME: RINKER SOUTH DADE BATCH PLANT
FACILITY LOCATION: 18501 SW 88TH ST
MIAMI 33022
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: PORTER JEFF PHONE:
CONTACT NAME: PHONE:
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2/11/2006 / 2/11/2011 (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.)?
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?
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?
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.)
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and
duration?
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

	1
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 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))				
<u>Unconfined</u> <u>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:				
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards, which shall include one or more of the following:				
 paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock 				
application of water or environmentally safe dust-sup				
emissions?		☐Yes ☐ No		
removal of particulate matter from roads and other pa	ved areas under control of the owner/operator	r to		
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to re		☐Yes ☐ No		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind				
particulate matter from stock piles?				
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate en	missions at the drop point to the truck?	☐Yes ☐ No		
DI DE VI GRUCI I GOVERNOVA AND DROGERVINES D	1 (0 010 000(4)/1)/1 T. I. G	1		
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Ru	le 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 repla		□Yes ⊠ No		
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		
FRANK DELGADO	7/30/2008			
Ingnostor's Name (Places Print)	Data of Inspection	_		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	7/2009			
		_		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
	_			
COMMENTS: THE FACILITY IS CLOSED. THIS FACILITY IS LISED AS A STAND-BY CONCRETE BATCH PLANT				

ACILITY IS CLOSED. THIS FACILITY IS USED AS A STAND-BY CONCRETE BATCH PLAI