

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

FACILITY LOCATION: 3575 SW 49TH WAY DAVIE 33314-2123 OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JACK RAIMONDI PHONE: (954)858-0788 CONTACT NAME: PHONE: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/2/2006 / 9/2/2011 (effective date) (end date) PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check ☑ only one box) ☑ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIANCE ☐ SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCO ARMS COMPLAINT	· /
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JACK RAIMONDI PHONE: (954)858-0788 CONTACT NAME: PHONE: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/2/2006 / 9/2/2011 (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.)? ☐ 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	AIRS ID#: 0112337 DA7	ГЕ: <u>4/27/09</u>	ARRIVE: <u>8.00</u>	DEPART: <u>11.00</u>
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JACK RAIMONDI PHONE: (954)858-0788 CONTACT NAME: PHONE: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/2/2006 / 9/2/2011 (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.)?— ☐ 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?— ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	FACILITY NAME: CO	NTINENTAL CONCRET	E - EAST BROWARD FAC.	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: JACK RAIMONDI PHONE: (954)858-0788 CONTACT NAME: PHONE: ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 9/2/2006 / 9/2/2011 (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 only 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?————————————————————————————————————	FACILITY LOCATION	: 3575 SW 49TH W	AY	
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 ☑ apropriate 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.)?———————————————————————————————————		DAVIE 33314-2	123	
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	OWNER/AUTHORIZEI	O REPRESENTATIVE:	JACK RAIMONDI PHO	ONE: (954)858-0788
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	CONTACT NAME:		PHO	ONE:
Non-Compliance Minor Non-Compliance Significant Non-Compliance	ENTITLEMENT PERIO			
Non-Compliance Minor Non-Compliance Significant Non-Compliance				
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?	∐ IN COMPLIANC	E MINOR Non-C	COMPLIANCE SIGNIFIC	CANT Non-COMPLIANCE
1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 62-297, F.A.C.)?			<u>TREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414	4, F.A.C.
skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)	 Were visible emiss 62-297, F.A.C.)? Are emissions from controlled to the exist a rate that is represented in the emission of the emissions from the total controlled to the exist at a rate that is represented in the emissions from the this question is 'skip 4.a') and 4.b' at a) Was the batchir b) During the visible duration?	m silos, weigh hoppers (bat xtent necessary to limit vis issions tests of the silo dust resentative of the normal s unachievable in practice?- in the weigh hopper (batche "Yes", then continue on to and continue on to question ing operation in operation d ble emissions test, was the	tchers), and other enclosed storages to the emissions to 5 percent opacity collector exhaust points was the silo loading rate, or at least at the er) operation controlled by the silo questions 4.a) and 4.b) below. If an 5.)	ge and conveying equipment ity?

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 the 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?	
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))	
	e 🗌
 (check papropriate 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.)————————————————————————————————————	
 (check papropriate 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

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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 re	easonable precautions to control unconfined					
emissions by:						
a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yard						
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock						
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-supp						
emissions?						
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other pay						
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to red		⊠Yes □ No				
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind b		⊠vas □ No				
particulate matter from stock piles?b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate em						
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to intigate em	assions at the drop point to the truck?	ĭ res ☐ No				
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Rule	e 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.					
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	.,,,					
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 differer	nt than that noted on the most					
recent notification form?	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 62-4.050, FAC) to the appropriate DEP or						
local program office?						
Courtney Pitters	4/27/2009					
		<u> </u>				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection					
	4/27/2010					
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection					
inspector o signature	rippionimate Bate of New Inspection					
COMMENTS:						