

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: A	NNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOV	ERY (CI)		
RI	E-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT N	O:		
AIRS ID#: 0112497 DATE	<u> 5/22/06</u>	ARRIVE: <u>9:00</u>	DEPART: <u>11:10</u>		
FACILITY NAME: PAVE	R CITY, LLC				
FACILITY LOCATION:	1251 NE 48TH STREET	,			
POMPANO BEACH 33064					
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL	C: JOSEPH BRITO	PHON	NE: (954)979-7483		
CONTACT NAME: Mike Brito		PHON	IE:		
REMITTANCE YEAR:	ENTITLI	EMENT PERIOD: 6/21/20			
PART I: INSPECTION CO	OMPLIANCE STATUS (che	eck donly one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE	MINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFICA	ANT 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 emissior 62-297, F.A.C.)?	s tests conducted during this	site visit according to EPA N	1ethod 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? 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.)					
a) Was the batching	operation in operation during	the visible emissions test?	☐Yes 🗵 No		
b) During the visible	emissions test, was the batch	ing rate representative of the			
5. If emissions from the from the silo dust coll	weigh hopper (batcher) opera lector, are the visible emission	ation are controlled by a dust ns tests of the weigh hopper (collector, which is separate		

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.)	e ⊠Yes □ No
b) annual compliance within 60 days prior to each anniversary of the air general permit notification form	
 Existing Facilities – (permitted pursuant to Rule 62-210.300(4), F.A.C., Air General Permits) 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 the 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. (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>)	
 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 Zonly one box.</i>) If this is a stationary concrete batching plant, is there one or more relocatable nonmetallic mineral processin 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.)————————————————————————————————————	ng □Yes ⊠ No □Yes ⊠ No ⊠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 (Dul. 62 206 220(4)(a) E.A.C.)						
Unconfined Emissions – (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? \overline{\text{\tin\text{\texi{\text{\text{\text{\texi\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\te						
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control						
emissions?	- ⊠Yes □ No					
3) removal of particulate matter from roads and other paved areas under control of the owner/operator						
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to redu	⊠Yes □ No					
4) reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind br						
particulate matter from stock piles?						
b) use of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emi	∐Yes ⊠ No					
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES - Rule	e 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.					
A. New or Modified Process Equipment						
1. Since the last inspection has there been						
a) installation of any new process equipment?		☐Yes ⊠ No				
b) alterations to existing process equipment without replace		□Yes ⊠ No				
c) replacement of existing equipment substantially differen		□Yes ⊠ No				
recent notification form?						
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?						
local program office.		□Yes □ No				
Art Pennetta	5/22/06					
		<u> </u>				
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection					
	5/07					
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection					
COMMENTS:						