

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY	(CI)		
	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 0250618 DA'	TE: <u>6/6/2007</u>	ARRIVE: <u>10:10 AM</u>	DEPART: <u>10:55 AM</u>		
FACILITY NAME: DADE CONCRETE PUMPING					
FACILITY LOCATION	5900 NW 122 Avenue				
	MIAMI 33178				
RESPONSIBLE OFFIC	IAL: RICARDO GONZALEZ	PHONE:	(305)823-1722		
CONTACT NAME:		PHONE:			
REMITTANCE YEAR:	ENTITLE	EMENT PERIOD: 7/13/2006 (effective date)	/ 7/13/2011 (end date)		
		-			
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u> <u>STATUS</u> (check ☑ only one box)					
☐ IN COMPLIANO	CE MINOR Non-COMPI	LIANCE SIGNIFICANT	Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))					
Stack Emissions					
1. Were visible emiss 62-297, F.A.C.)?	sions tests conducted during this s	site visit according to EPA Metho	od 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
	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.)					
a) Was the batchi	ng operation in operation during tible emissions test, was the batchi	the visible emissions test?			
duration?			Yes No		
from the silo dust	collector, are the visible emission	s tests of the weigh hopper (batc			

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?	☐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 to the AGP Notification form submission, and within 60 days prior to each anniversary date? Yes \sum 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))				
	le 🗌			
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 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>) 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? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)	ing ☐Yes ⊠ No ☐Yes ⊠ No			
 (check ☑ appropriate box(es)) 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>) 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? (<i>If your answer to this question is YES</i>, then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)	ing □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 emissions by: a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, ar 1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas 2) application of water or environmentally safe du emissions?	nd yards, which shall include one or more of the following: s, stock piles, and yards? st-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control				
particulate matter from stock piles? No					
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Yes No					
 b) alterations to existing process equipment without c) replacement of existing equipment substantially recent notification form? d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did the notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-4. 	Yes ⊠ No treplacement? □Yes ⊠ No different than that noted on the most □Yes ⊠ No e owner submit a new and complete				
FRANK DELGADO	6/6/07				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection				
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection				
COMMENTS: THE FLYASH SILO WAS TESTED BY BIL I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS FROM THE VE TEST STARTED AT 10:10 AM.					