

## **CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT**



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) COMPLAINT/DI	ISCOVERY (CI)		
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLA	AINT NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0990141 DATE: <u>2/2/07</u> ARRIVE:	DEPART:		
FACILITY NAME: TARMAC FLORIDA (FAIRGROUNDS)			
FACILITY LOCATION: 9151 FAIRGROUNDS ROAD			
WEST PALM BEACH 33411-			
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: TERRY LANCASTER	<b>PHONE:</b> (561)504-6787		
CONTACT NAME: Charles Robertson	<b>PHONE:</b> (738)385-8350		
REMITTANCE YEAR: 2007 ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 2	2/10/2006 / 2/10/2011 ffective date) (end date)		
PART I: <u>INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS</u> (check ☑ only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ 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 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?			
to this question is "Yes", then continue on to questions 4.a) and 4.b) belo	ow. If answer is "No" then		
skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)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 duration?			
5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh h conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching at a rate that is representative.	opper (batcher) dust collector		

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.)	he ⊠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?————  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?	
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 t test was completed?	
•	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C.	e 🗌
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? ( <i>Please check ☐ only one box.</i> )  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? ( <i>If your answer to this question is YES</i> , then proceed to questions 2.a), thru 2.d), below.)————————————————————————————————————	

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)				
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))				
Unantinal Emissions (Dula 62 206 220(A)(c) EAC)				
<u>Unconfined Emissions</u> – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)	reasonable precautions to control unconfined			
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 ya	ards which shall include one or more of the fo	llowing.		
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?				
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other p				
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?				
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate e	emissions at the drop point to the truck?	⊠Yes □ No		
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES – R	2nla 62-210 200(4)(d)4 F A C			
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	.uic 02-210.500(+)(u)+., r.a.c.			
A. 100 of modified 1100055 24displicate				
Since the last inspection has there been				
a) installation of any new process equipment?		□Yes ⊠ No		
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?				
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially differ	b) alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?			
recent notification form?				
recent notification form? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No d) If you answered $\underline{YES}$ 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		
Randall B. Miller	February 2, 2007			
		_		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	February 30, 2008			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	_		
<b>COMMENTS:</b> Satisfactory annual inspection and VE Method 9 E	valuation (Truck Loadout Baghouse); no fugit			

**COMMENTS:** Satisfactory annual inspection and VE Method 9 Evaluation (Truck Loadout Baghouse); no fugitive emissions observed from traffic areas, truck loadout or exit aprons; shroud adequately containing fugitive emissions from truck loading funnel-miller