OWERTAL PROTECTION	
San Marin	
FLORIDA	

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2) RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	COMPLAINT/DISCO			
AIRS ID#: 0112500 DATE: <u>1/19/2010</u>	ARRIVE: <u>1230</u>	DEPART: <u>230</u>		
FACILITY NAME: GU SOUTH YARD				
FACILITY LOCATION: 2301 COLLEGE AV	Έ			
DAVIE 33317-730	02			
OWNER/AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:	MICHAEL MAHONEY PH	ONE: (561)478-9980		
CONTACT NAME:	PH	ONE:		
ENTITLEMENT PERIOD: 1/17/2008 / 1/17/2 (effective date) (end dat				
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS				
IN COMPLIANCE MINOR Non-CO	OMPLIANCE 🗌 SIGNIFI	ICANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUI</u> (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	<u>REMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414	4, F.A.C.		
Stack Emissions				
1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during	this site visit according to EPA	A Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter		
62-297, F.A.C.)?2. Are emissions from silos, weigh hoppers (batc				
controlled to the extent necessary to limit visit	ble emissions to 5 percent opac	ity? Xes No		
During visible emissions tests of the silo dust at a rate that is representative of the normal sil	o loading rate, or at least at the	e 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 si	Yes No		
to this question is "Yes", then continue on to g	uestions 4.a) and 4.b) below. I	f answer is "No" then		
skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question a) Was the batching operation in operation du	5.) ring the visible emissions test?	UYes No		
b) During the visible emissions test, was the b	atching rate representative of t	he normal batching rate and		
duration?5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher)	operation are controlled by a du	ust collector, which is separate		
from the silo dust collector, are the visible emi conducted while batching at a rate that is repre-				

PART II: <u>TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. – (continued)
(check ☑ appropriate box(es)
 <u>Compliance Demonstration</u> - (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? Xest Complexity Action 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? ∑Yes ∑No

PART III: <u>OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS</u> – 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> , <i>then proceed to questions 2.a</i>), <i>thru 2.d</i>), <i>below</i> ,)

	Yes 🖾 No Yes 🖾 No
	Yes 🗌 No Yes 🗍 No
	Yes No
3. Does the owner/operator of the concrete batching plant maintain a log book or books to account for:	
	Yes 🗌 No
b) material processed on a monthly basis?	Yes 🗌 No
c) the sulfur content of the fuel being burned (Fuel supplier certifications)?	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))

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? XYes No
	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 to
		re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter? XYes No
	4)	reduction of stock pile height, or installation of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of
		particulate matter from stock piles? 🖾 Yes 🗌 No
b)	use	e of spray bar, chute, or partial enclosure to mitigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? Xes No

PART IV: <u>SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDURES</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C. A. <u>New or Modified Process Equipment</u>

1.	Sinc	the last inspection has there been		
		installation of any new process equipment?		🛛 No
	b)	alterations to existing process equipment without replacement?	Yes	🛛 No
		replacement of existing equipment substantially different than that noted on the most		
		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?	Yes	🗌 No

Courtney Pitters

Inspector's Name (Please Print)

1/19/10

Date of Inspection

1/19/11

Inspector's Signature

Approximate Date of Next Inspection

COMMENTS: VE testing was conducted during CY 2010 compliance inspection. No air violations were observed during the walk through or report portions of the inspection.