

CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE: ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCOVERY (CI)			
RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT NO:			
AIRS ID#: 0112605 DATE:	ARRIVE: <u>9:00 AM</u> DEPART: <u>11:00 AM</u>			
FACILITY NAME: SOUTHERN GROUTS AND MOI	RTARS			
FACILITY LOCATION: 1505 SW 2nd Place				
POMPANO BEACH 3	33069			
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: RON PICOU	PHONE: (954)943-2288			
CONTACT NAME:	PHONE:			
REMITTANCE YEAR: ENTITL	LEMENT PERIOD: 4/7/2002 / 4/7/2007 (end date)			
PART I: INSPECTION COMPLIANCE STATUS (ch	neck 🗹 only one box)			
☐ IN COMPLIANCE ☐ MINOR Non-COMP	PLIANCE SIGNIFICANT Non-COMPLIANCE			
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIRE	MENTS - Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C.			
(check ☑ appropriate box(es))				
Stack Emissions 1. Were visible emissions tests conducted during this	s site visit according to EPA Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter			
62-297, F.A.C.)?		□ 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?				
4. Are emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) or to this question is "Yes", then continue on to ques	peration controlled by the silo dust collector? (If answer			
skip 4.a) and 4.b) and continue on to question 5.)-				
a) Was the batching operation in operation during b) During the visible emissions test, was the batch	g the visible emissions test?	□ No		
	hing rate representative of the normal hatching rate and			
	hing rate representative of the normal batching rate and Yes			
5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) open from the silo dust collector, are the visible emission	hing rate representative of the normal batching rate and	□ No		

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?	☐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))	
	le 🗌
 (check appropriate 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
 (check ppropriate 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 ponly 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

PART III: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIR (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	<u>REMENTS</u> – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)			
(check is appropriate box(cs))				
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching pla				
emissions by:	1			
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? Yes No				
2) application of water or environmentally safe dust-suppressant chemicals when necessary to control				
	d other paved areas under control of the owner/operator to			
re-entrainment, and from building or work areas to reduce airborne particulate matter?				
	of wind breaks to mitigate wind entrainment of			
particulate matter from stock pries:	itigate emissions at the drop point to the truck? \Boxed Yes \Boxed No			
0) use of spray var, chure, or partial encrosure to m	ingate emissions at the drop point to the track:			
PART IV: SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND PROCEDUR	<u>ES</u> – Rule 62-210.300(4)(d)4., F.A.C.			
A. New or Modified Process Equipment	'			
1 Character last immention has there been	'			
1. Since the last inspection has there been a) installation of any pay process equipment?	□Yes ⊠ No			
a) Installation of any new process equipment:	out replacement?			
c) replacement of existing equipment substantial	Ju 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			
Elizabeth F. Susky	12/09/2005			
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection			
	05/2007			
	05/2006			
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection			
1 0	11			
COMMENTS: On 12/00/2005 facility was conducting Visi	ible Emissions testing which was prompted by NOV issued by EPD for			
not conducting proper testing after permitting or annually.	ible Emissions testing which was prompted by 140 v issued by Li D 161			
not conducting proper testing after permitting or annually.				
The passed this Visible Emissions test and it was submitted t	to the Department in a timely manner.			
Pagge	70 W. 2 CP W			