

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	OMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)
RE-INSPECTION (FUI) A	RMS COMPLAINT NO:
AIRS ID#: 0250841 DATE: <u>9/18/2008</u> AR	RIVE: <u>10:30 AM</u> DEPART: <u>11:20 AM</u>
FACILITY NAME: FLORIDA BLOCK PLANT #1	
<b>FACILITY LOCATION:</b> 8725 NW 91 Street	
MEDLEY 33178-1523	
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: AMIR HA	GHAYEGH <b>PHONE</b> :
CONTACT NAME:	PHONE:
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 6/23/2008 / 6/22/2013 (effective date) (end date)	
(enecuve date) (end date)	
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (check	only one box)
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMPLIAN	CE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	<u>S</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.
(check <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))	<u>S</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions</li> <li>1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site visible emissions</li> </ul>	
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))  Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated the	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions <ol> <li>Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violates of the site of the controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions.</li> <li>During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the normal silo loading in the controlled to the extent necessary to the necessa</li></ol></li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter  Other enclosed storage and conveying equipment ons to 5 percent opacity?  No xhaust points was the loading of the silo conducted rate, or at least at the minimum 25 tons per hour rate,
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions.</li> <li>3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading unless such rate is unachievable in practice?</li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter  Other enclosed storage and conveying equipment ons to 5 percent opacity?
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated 62-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated 2.297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions  1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions.  2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batchers), and controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions.  3. During visible emissions tests of the silo dust collector e at a rate that is representative of the normal silo loading unless such rate is unachievable in practice?</li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter
<ul> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>Stack Emissions</li> <li>1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this site violated 2-297, F.A.C.)?</li></ul>	isit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter

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 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 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))			
	le 🗌		
<ol> <li>(check  papropriate box(es))</li> <li>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 Donly one box.</i>)</li> <li>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.)</li></ol>	ing		
<ol> <li>(check ☑ appropriate box(es))</li> <li>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>)</li> <li>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.)</li></ol>	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 <b>☑</b> appropriate box(es))				
Unconfined Emissions (Dule 62 206 220(4)(a) E.A.C.)				
<u>Unconfined 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:				
1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking areas, stock piles, and yards? \(\sime\)Yes \(\sime\) No				
<ol><li>application of water or environmentally safe dust-s</li></ol>				
emissions?				
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to				
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?				
4) reduction of stock pile neight, or installation of will	nd breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of	⊠vas □ No		
particulate matter from stock piles?				
b) use of spray bar, churc, or partial electosure to fillingate	cennssions at the drop point to the truck?			
		1		
PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 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?		☐Yes ⊠ No		
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most				
recent notification form?				
d) If you answered <b>YES</b> 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?				
local program office?		∐Yes ∐ No		
FRANK DELGADO	9/18/2008			
FRAIN DELOADO	9/18/2008			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	9/2009			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
	- -			
COMMENTS: THE FACILITY WAS OPERATIONAL LIDID NOT ORSERVE ANY VISIRLE EMISSIONS FROM THE				

**COMMENTS:** THE FACILITY WAS OPERATIONAL. I DID NOT OBSERVE ANY VISIBLE EMISSIONS FROM THE SILO'S DUST COLLECTOR. A VISIBLE EMISSIONS TEST WAS PERFORMED THIS YEAR BY ARLINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES.