

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) ☐ COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI) ☐			
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 0210042 DATE: <u>02/24/09</u> ARRIVE: <u>09:30</u> DEPART: <u>10:20</u>			
FACILITY NAME: D.C.KERCKHOFF COMPANY			
FACILITY LOCATION: 1901 ELSA AVENUE			
NAPLES 33942			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JOHN VILMONT PHONE: (239)597-7218			
CONTACT NAME: Dan Kerchoff PHONE:			
<b>ENTITLEMENT PERIOD:</b> 8/23/2007 / 8/23/2012			
(effective date) (end date)			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (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.)?			
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?			
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.) \bigsymbol{\text{\text{No}}} \bigsymbol{\text{No}}			
a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test? $\square$ Yes $\overline{\boxtimes}$ No			
a) Was the batching operation in operation during the visible emissions test?  b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?			
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?			
b) During the visible emissions test, was the batching rate representative of the normal batching rate and duration?			

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 tannual 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?	the - Yes No
PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-210.300(4)(c)2., F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	
	le 🗌
<ul> <li>(check  appropriate box(es))</li> <li>1. Is this facility: 1) a stationary  (2) a relocatable (3) both, stationary and relocatable</li> </ul>	ing □Yes ⊠ No □Yes ⊠ No

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS - Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)			
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))			
H			
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)	et tales researchle processions to control unconfined		
Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching plant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined emissions by:      Propagament of roads, perking gross, stock piles, and words, which shall include one or more of the following:			
	ust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to contro		
emissions?		No. □ No.	
	other paved areas under control of the owner/operato		
	eas to reduce airborne particulate matter?		
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of		□ 168 □ 140	
	while breaks to infugate while entrainment of	Yes No	
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to miti			
b) use of spray bar, enuce, of partial enclosure to find	gate emissions at the drop point to the truck:		
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURE	<u>S</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.		
A. New or Modified Process Equipment			
1. Since the last inspection has there been			
b) alterations to existing process equipment withou	ut replacement?	□Yes ⊠ No	
<ul> <li>c) replacement of existing equipment substantially</li> </ul>	ļ		
recent notification form?	- ∐Yes ⊠ No		
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			
local program office?		Yes No	
Wayne Lewis	02/24/09		
, wy 110 20 1115	<del></del>		
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection	<del></del>	
1 , , ,	ı		
	02/24/10		
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection	<del>_</del>	
1 0	11		
COMMENTS:			
COMMENTS.			