

## CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT



## COMPLIANCE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

INSPECTION TYPE:	ANNUAL (INS1, INS2)	COMPLAINT/DISCO	VERY (CI)		
1	RE-INSPECTION (FUI)	ARMS COMPLAINT	NO:		
AIRS ID#: 0951267 DAT	E: 6/28/06	ARRIVE: <u>0945</u>	DEPART: <u>1110</u>		
FACILITY NAME: S&L	MATERIALS				
FACILITY LOCATION:	28001 SR 520				
	CHRISTMAS 32709				
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: Tama Davis, Treasurer PHONE: (407)870-0066					
CONTACT NAME: Corey Myers, Operations Manager PHONE: (407)568-3709					
REMITTANCE YEAR: 2	2004 ENTITLI	EMENT PERIOD: 9/27/2 (effective			
PART I: <u>INSPECTION</u> (	COMPLIANCE STATUS (che	eck 🗹 only one box)			
IN COMPLIANCE	E MINOR Non-COMP	LIANCE SIGNIFIC	CANT Non-COMPLIANCE		
PART II: TESTING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS – Rule 62-296.414, F.A.C. (check ☑ appropriate box(es))					
Stack Emissions					
1. Were visible emission 62-297, F.A.C.)?	ons tests conducted during this	site visit according to EPA	Method 9 (Ref.: Chapter 🔀	Yes No	
	silos, weigh hoppers (batchers)			7Ves □ No	
controlled to the extent necessary to limit visible emissions to 5 percent opacity? \( \subseteq \text{Yes} \) 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) ar	nd continue on to question 5.)				
b) During the visib	g operation in operation during le emissions test, was the batch	ing rate representative of th	ne normal batching rate and		
	he weigh hopper (batcher) opera			]Yes 🗌 No	
from the silo dust co	5. If emissions from the weigh hopper (batcher) operation are controlled by a dust collector, which is separate from the silo dust collector, are the visible emissions tests of the weigh hopper (batcher) dust collector conducted while batching at a rate that is representative of the normal batching rate and duration?   Yes  No				
conducted while bar	tening at a rate that is represent	ative of the normal datening	g rate and duration?	] 1 cs   100	

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 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 ☑ 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
<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: OPERATING/RECORDKEEPING REQUIR (check ☑ appropriate box(es))	REMENTS – Rule 62-296.414(2)(a) and (b), F.A.C. (continued)
Unconfined Emissions – (Rule 62-296.320(4)(c), F.A.C.)  1. Does the owner /operator of the concrete batching pla emissions by:  a) management of roads, parking areas, stock piles,  1) paving and maintenance of roads, parking are  2) application of water or environmentally safe of emissions?	ant take reasonable precautions to control unconfined  , and yards, which shall include one or more of the following: reas, stock piles, and yards?
<ul> <li>b) alterations to existing process equipment without control replacement of existing equipment substantially recent notification form?</li> <li>d) If you answered <u>YES</u> to any of the above, did notification form and appropriate fee (Rule 62-</li> </ul>	
Jodi D. Dittell	6/28/2006
Inspector's Name (Please Print)	Date of Inspection 6/28/2007
Inspector's Signature	Approximate Date of Next Inspection
<b>COMMENTS:</b> The facility mixes concrete with a mixture of essentially no "concrete batching". The facility is a sand qua	of sand and shell, which is dumped into trucks for usage. There is arry.
	unit was loaded at a rate of > 25 TPH @ 8-10psi (truck load 26.65 tons). @ 10 psi (truck load 27.23 tons). No visible emissions were observed

The facility's roadways were noticeably wet. No unconfined emissions were observed leaving the property. No objectionable odors

were detected.